104 5 Lond Ed. 1765. No. 34

REMARKS

ON AN

Anonymous TRACT,

ENTITLED

An ANSWER to Dr. MAYHEW's OBSERVATIONS

On the CHARTER and CONDUCT of the SOCIETY for the Propagation of the Goſpel in Foreign Parts.

BEING A

Second Defence of the ſaid Obſervations.

By *JONATHAN MAYHEW*, D.D.
Paſtor of the WEST Church in Boſton.

BOSTON:

Printed and Sold by R. and S. DRAPER, in Newbury-Street; EDES and GILL, in Queen-Street; and T. & J. FLEET, in Cornhill. 1764.

BRITISH MUSEUM

REMARKS

ON AN

Anonymous TRACT, &c.

THE Author of the Tract before me, has thought proper to conceal his name and quality, in common with others who have written againſt the *Obſervations*: So that whatever may be his real dignity, I cannot with propriety ſpeak of him under any higher title than that of *gentleman*. He is doubtleſs a perſon of excellent ſenſe, and an happy talent at writing; apparently free from the ſordid, illiberal ſpirit of bigotry; one of a cool temper, and who often ſhews much candor; well acquainted with the affairs of the Society, and, in general, a fair reaſoner. To ſay this, is but doing juſtice to the merits of an opponent; a ſpecies of juſtice too ſeldom found in controverſial writers. And all this I acknowledge with much more pleaſure than ever I had in expoſing the contrary qualities in an adverſary: It being far more agreeable to me to praiſe, where praiſe is due, than to blame, even where blame is highly deſerved.

It is not my intention, in the following pages, to examine every thing which this reſpectable writer has offered in oppoſition to my *Obſervations*. Some, which I thought did not very materially affect the merits of the cauſe, are paſſed over for the ſake of brevity. Others are left unnoticed, becauſe the ſame things in effect were ſufficiently

conſidered in my *Defence* of the *Obſervations*, publiſhed in Boſton ſome time ago. I have neither ſo much leiſure or health, nor ſuch an itch for altercation, as to protract a diſpute upon circumſtantial matters. Nor do I conceive that an argument increaſes in ſtrength, by being frequently repeated, as a ſnow-ball does in magnitude, by being often rolled over and over. If what was offered in my *Defence* againſt a certain *Examiner* and *Letter-writer*, was valid, it will be equally ſo againſt this gentleman, ſo far as their objections are alike: If not, it would be no advantage to me to ſay the ſame things over again. For theſe reaſons I requeſt, that it may not be ſuppoſed, or taken for granted, that I concede to every thing in the Tract before me, which I do not take a particular notice of; or that I paſs any over, that are material, from a conſciouſneſs of my inability to anſwer them. Not theſe, but thoſe which I have already aſſigned, are the true reaſons of my conduct in this reſpect.

I muſt obſerve, though with reluctance, that there are ſome paſſages in this *Anſwer*, which I do not well know how to reconcile with that candor and ingenuity, which have already been allowed to the author. The firſt paragraph is one of them. He is there pleaſed to ſay, that my book was written, partly againſt *the church of England in general*; partly againſt *the conduct of the Society*, and partly againſt *appointing biſhops for America*. He indeed grants, immediately after, that the *firſt* of theſe three, was *not formally propoſed by me as one head of my work*. By which diſtinction he plainly leads his reader to ſuppoſe, that both the other points were *formally propoſed* by me, as coming within my deſign: Whereas the affair of *biſhops* was not, but altogether as incidental as what relates to *the church of England in general*; reſpecting which latter, I ſaid expreſsly, 'It was by *no means* my 'deſign in this publication, to enter into the controverſy

'betwixt

'betwixt the church of England and us'†. Notwithſtanding this declaration, and the gentleman's own confeſſion, he begins with a formal defence of the church of England againſt ſome of my caſual remarks thereon; ſaying, 'If ſatisfaction be previouſly given to candid 'perſons on *this point*, they will be *better prepared* for 'conſidering the *other two*"‖: Still ſuggeſting that there were *two* other points, formally diſcuſſed by me, contrary to fact. In *him* let this paſs for an inſtance of *inadvertence* only: *Aliquandò bonus*, &c. But had ſome other perſons ſet out in the ſame manner, multiplying *one* deſign into *three*, repreſenting it as having been *in my view throughout the whole of my book**, to oppoſe the church of England, and undertaking to give previous ſatisfaction to candid perſons on this point, that they might be the *better prepared* to conſider the *other two*: Had ſome other perſons taken this method, it might naturally have been conſidered as a mere piece of craft, or an unworthy artifice, to prepoſſeſs their unwary epiſcopal readers in favour of their deſign, to prejudice them againſt me and mine, and thereby to render them very *partial* judges of the true and only point which I undertook to debate. Did his readers, who are probably almoſt all of them epiſcopalians, need to be thus *prepared* for conſidering the argument reſpecting the Society? But I am very unwilling to ſuppoſe, this gentleman had a deſign that would be ſo little to his honor, and would make my encomiums have the appearance of *flattery*. The reader is therefore deſired to put the moſt favourable conſtruction he can, on this conduct; and by that means, if poſſible, to juſtify my commendations: For I would not have any one conſtrue them into *adulation*, equally to the diſhonor of my worthy *Anſwerer* and my ſelf.

In

† *Obſerv.* p. 126.——*N. B.* As the gentleman has all along referred to the London Edition of the *Obſervations*, I ſhall do the ſame, whenever I have occaſion to refer to them: I ſhall alſo refer to the Lond. Edit. of his *Anſwer*. ‖ P. 3. * Ibid.

In purſuance of this deſign, duly to *prepare* his readers for conſidering the main point, he proceeds to a vindication of the church of England, and of the hierarchy, in oppoſition to certain expreſſions which I occaſionally made uſe of. Some of theſe might perhaps be too harſh and irritating. Had epiſcopalians in general ſhewn the ſame love to religious liberty, and the ſame moderation towards non-conformiſts, that this gentleman has, I am confident he would not have thought, that he had any ground of complaint in this reſpect. I have the honor to agree with him in what he ſays in different places, concerning the intolerant ſpirit that formerly prevailed, even among proteſtants of almoſt every denomination, and the better ſpirit of mutual forbearance, that has for ſome time been growing among them. Would to God that they may continue to cultivate the latter, without abating in a zeal that is *according to knowledge*, for the great, indiſputable doctrines and duties of chriſtianity, or degenerating into a ſtate of indifference and ſcepticiſm about all religion; the oppoſite extreme, and not a more innocent one, tho' leſs pernicious to the peace of ſociety, and common rights of mankind, than bigotry and perſecution.

But my real ſentiments concerning the conſtitution, worſhip and diſcipline of the church of England, are no ways altered by any thing which this gentleman has ſaid. If the Lutherans prefer her communion to the Calviniſtic, the Calviniſts to the Lutheran, and the Greeks to both, (which, by the way, is aſſerted without proof;) or if moſt, or even all of them *blame the* Engliſh *diſſenters for ſeparating from it* †; yet this carries no proper ground of conviction with it, that her communion is the *beſt*. A true proteſtant judges, not by the majority of votes or numbers, but by ſcripture and reaſon. The Gentleman ſays, I ſeem to entertain the worſe opinion of the church of England, 'becauſe the members of the church of Rome 'likewiſe *eſteem* it more than they do others.' Truly I can

† Page 4.

can hardly think any church a very pure or ſcriptural one, which has the *eſteem* of ſo corrupt and antichriſtian a church as that of Rome, the *mother of harlots, and abominations of the earth.* He immediately ſubjoins; 'But 'we have to reply, that they *hate* it more alſo, as the 'moſt dangerous enemy to their cauſe, and ſtrongeſt 'bulwark of the reformation'.* So that this gentleman ſeems to draw an argument for the excellency of his church, not only from the *eſteem*, but from the *hatred* of that of Rome: Neither of which conſiderations has any tendency to make me think the better of her. Becauſe this eſteem of the church of Rome on one hand, and her hatred on the other, are moſt naturally reſolved into ſuch cauſes, as are rather diſhonourable to the church of England, than the contrary; her eſteem, into the remaining ſimilitude between them, and her hatred, into a rivalſhip for power, worldly ſplendor and preheminence. What the gentleman thinks the church of Rome eſteems that of England for, whether her excellencies or blemiſhes, he has not told us; I am ſatisfied, it is on account of the latter; and leave others to conjecture as they pleaſe. But he himſelf has obſerved, that the Roman-catholicks hate the church, of England, conſidered *as the moſt dangerous enemy to their cauſe.* It is as natural for them to do ſo, as for one gaily-attired lady to look with an evil eye upon another; eſpecially conſidering that the church of England has a mighty King for her head, and lays claim to ſome of the higheſt powers and prerogatives aſſerted by the other; 'power to decree rites and ceremonies, and authority in 'controverſies of faith.'‖ Here is a foundation laid, broad enough to ſupport almoſt any ſuperſtructure, tho' as enormous an one, as that which is raiſed on the ſuppoſed infallibility and power of *St. Peter's ſucceſſor.* Who then can wonder, if the church of Rome hates that of England, as a dangerous enemy and rival?

And hath not the church of England acted as if ſhe were really poſſeſſed of this extraordinary power and authority

* P. 4. ‖ Article 20.

authority, reſpecting rites, ceremonies and controverſies of faith? The gentleman indeed allows, that the ſaid church hath *ſome appointments in it, which the ſcripture doth not require.* This is candidly, tho' very cautiouſly ſaid. But when he ſubjoins, a little after, 'Ours hath 'not *many things* of this kind, nor lays *great ſtreſs* upon 'them'†; I am a little ſurpriſed: Tho', to return one of his compliments to me, 'One muſt ſuppoſe that *he* '*believes himſelf, and as far as poſſible*, I would believe 'him alſo'‖. But it is no eaſy matter for a perſon who duly conſiders the offices of baptiſm, confirmation, the Lord's ſupper, ordination, matrimony and burial; the numerous faſts and feſtivals, ſaints days and ſinners, the creeds, the liturgy and the canons of ſaid church in general, to think that *appointments* of the kind he ſpeaks of, are not *many*, or that no *great ſtreſs* is laid upon them. Can any one live in regular communion with that church, without ſubmitting to many ſuch? Can people come into the World, tarry in, or go out of it? can they be born, live or die, without them? And for how many things which, to *non-conforming* underſtandings at leaſt, appear extremely trivial, do the canons ſtill in force declare, that people ſhall be *ipſo facto* excommunicated, and not reſtored till they retract their ſaid *wicked errors*?

The gentleman ſeems to think that appointments of this nature, if they are not ſuch as the ſcripture expreſly forbids, tho' it doth not require them, ought to be complied with. In which I cannot agree with him; becauſe, tho' they may not be expreſly forbidden, yet they are implicitly, and by natural conſtruction. The law of God may be in a great meaſure *made void* by the traditions, and numerous inventions of men in his worſhip, not one of which is perhaps directly repugnant to any particular precept. And it is ſaid, partly with reference to appointments of that kind, which ſome think ſo innocent, comely and expedient, *In vain do they worſhip me, teaching for doctrines the commandments of men.* Some of our Engliſh

† P. 4. ‖ p. 8.

Engliſh epiſcopalians have ſhewn a laudable zeal in this reſpect, againſt the church of Rome; for departing from the ſcriptures as the only rule of chriſtian faith, worſhip and diſcipline; not perhaps conſidering how juſtly this charge might be retorted upon them, in a degree, by proteſtant diſſenters. For example; 'The thing I would 'recommend to the conſideration of all *papiſts*,' ſays a learned and able writer, 'is *their departure from ſcripture*. 'Why do they command abſtinence from *fleſh*, on ſo many 'days in every week? Why abſtain from *meats*, which *God 'hath ordained to be received by all with thanksgiving?* 'Why is ſuch a faſt enjoined, as may be kept with drinking of *wine*, and other, even ſtronger liquors? I do 'not charge them with allowing of exceſſes in liquors, 'but with enjoining ſo many faſt and meagre days, on a '*ſpiritual*, not a *medicinal* account; and this, *without 'authority from Chriſt or his apoſtles*' †.—If ſuch reaſoning as this will hold good againſt the church of Rome, as doubtleſs it will, let it be fairly conſidered, whether it will not be unanſwerable, if applied to another church; and fully juſtify a receſſion from her; eſpecially if many of her appointments, on which great ſtreſs is laid, are apparently ſuperſtitious, and not only unſcriptural, but antiſcriptural.

I humbly conceive, the gentleman goes a little too far, when he intimates that there are ſimilar appointments *in all the churches in the world*: † I know of ſome churches at leaſt, in which there are none ſuch. But if this were fact, it would be no juſtification of them; but rather a proof, that all churches and nations have *drank* too deeply of a certain *poiſonous cup*, and departed from the ſimplicity that is in Chriſt, and which was in the truly apoſtolical churches. Very great corruptions were introduced much earlier than many are willing to allow; and were confirmed even by general councils. For, to uſe the words of

 the

† See an excellent, and very important Tract, entitled *An Enquiry how far the Papiſts ought to be treated here* [in England] *as good ſubjects*, &c. By the late Dr. *Syker*. † P. 4.

the ſame learned epiſcopalian divine, (to whom I juſt now referred) in another important tract, 'What have general councils been (I ſpeak of all *univerſally* from the council of *Nice* to the council of *Trent*) but the meetings of *corrupt*, *ambitious*, *intriguing*, *contentious* men; who never once attempted to ſerve the cauſe of *Chriſt*, but *themſelves*: Who have ever, by fraud and craft, and cunning, aimed at *ſuperiority* and *power* over thoſe whom they had a mind to oppreſs, and who never attempted to eſtabliſh truth as it lies in Chriſt: Who have endeavoured to gain a majority by art and power, *without regard to the bible*, or *what is there enjoined*: Who have always contended for ſome *addition* or other to the goſpel, but never to leave the word of God to *its own native ſimplicity*: Who, laſtly, have wreſted and perverted the *ſcripture*, but never have taught it *pure* and *uncorrupted*‖?'

But to proceed to other matters: Speaking of the hierarchy, the gentleman ſays, that in my *favourite compariſon* of the churches of England and Rome, *I quite miſtake the matter*; becauſe, 'not *one*, but *two* prelates preſide over the church of England;' and this, he ſays, 'greviouſly ſpoils the ſimilitude.'† I ſhould have thought that an epiſcopalian would rather have ſuppoſed the diſparity to conſiſt in the pretended *powers* of his Holineſs, and thoſe of an Engliſh Archbiſhop: Does the difference lie principally in this, that Rome has but *one* ſuch great prelate, and England *two*? I think not. And the gentleman would doubtleſs have ſpared this critical remark, had he recollected that I made uſe of Mr. *Apthorp*'s expreſſion, who ſpake of the Archbiſhop of Canterbury only as *preſiding*;—'the excellent *prelate*, who now ſo worthily *preſides* over the church of England, and the Society itſelf'‖. It is enough for me to be anſwerable for my own miſtakes and inaccuracies. As my *Anſwerer* has undertaken

‖ See *The Reaſonableneſs of mending and executing the laws againſt Papiſts*, p. 21. † p. 5 ‖ Conſid. on the Charter, &c.

undertaken that gentleman's defence in ſome other reſpects, it is at leaſt as incumbent upon himſelf, as it is upon me, either to juſtify, or to apologize for that expreſſion. The gentleman adds, that I knew the Archbiſhops preſide *in ſubordination to the king*;' though he is pleaſed to ſay, that I *diſingenuouſly hint a doubt of it**. I indeed well knew, that the King is the legal Head of the church of England, that all her biſhops and clergy take the oath of ſupremacy, and that they ſolemnly diſclaim all ſpiritual power and juriſdiction, but as under, and derived from him. Of theſe things I intimated no *doubt*; but only, whether the ſaid biſhops and clergy were always conſiſtent with themſelves, in reference thereto; or whether they have not often claimed ſuch an independency on the crown and ſtate, as to ſhew them very inſincere in their oaths and ſubſcriptions. And let thoſe who are acquainted with the writings of many high-flyers, and their jure-divino-pretenſions, judge whether there was any *diſingenuity* or not, in hinting a doubt in this reſpect. Beſides, the gentleman is miſtaken if he ſuppoſes, I meant to draw an *exact* parallel between the churches of England and Rome. And if any perſon of a tolerable capacity, could be ſuppoſed ſo ignorant and preſumptuous as to undertake this, he would not, ſurely, compare an Engliſh archbiſhop to his Holineſs: An Archbiſhop in the church of England, is not equal even to a Cardinal in that of Rome. Another perſon might, with much more *plauſibility*, be compared to the Pope, however *abſurd* the compariſon would appear, upon due examination. For is it not declared, (37. Hen. VIII.) 'That archbiſhops, biſhops, archdeacons, and 'other eccleſiaſtical perſons, have no manner of juriſdic-'tion *eccleſiaſtical*, but by and under the *King*'s majeſty, 'the only undoubted ſupreme Head of the church of 'England, to whom, *by holy ſcripture*, power and au-'thority is given to hear and determine *all manner of cau-'ſes eccleſiaſtical*, and to correct *all vice and ſin whatſo-'ever*; and to all ſuch perſons as the *King*'s majeſty ſhall

* Anſ. p. 5.

'appoint thereunto'—? And is it not alſo declared (1. Ed. VI. ch. 2.) That '*all authority of juriſdiction ſpiri-*'*tual*, is drawn and deducted from the *King*'s majeſty, 'as ſupreme Head----and ſo juſtly acknowledged by the 'clergy of theſe realms?' And have not the Roman-catholics maliciouſly reproached the Engliſh nation with ſetting up, in effect, another Pope, in oppoſition to him, whoſe ſupremacy they renounced? But I am far enough from making any ſuch odious compariſon myſelf; being very ſenſible how unjuſt it would be in *many reſpects*, whatever malice may ſuggeſt.---To the gentleman's ſurmiſe, that *I would deny it to be in ſubordination to the King, that I preſide over the* Weſt-Church *in Boſton*,* I ſhall at preſent only ſay with the Apoſtle, 'Let every 'ſoul be ſubject to the higher powers;' and that I endeavour to conform to the true ſpirit of that chriſtian precept, 'Give unto *Cæſar* the things which are *Cæſar*'s, and 'to *God* the things which are *God*'s.'

The gentleman goes on to ſpeak of our right reverend Lords the biſhops. Amongſt other things he ſays, thoſe with whom they live, find not that they are ſo high as, by their elevation, *to do harm, or cauſe fear*; and that they wear no *mitres*. He adds 'If they are ſtiled Lords, 'it is becauſe, by the ancient conſtitution of our country, 'they ſit in the upper houſe of parliament; *where, I* 'believe, *they are thought as uſeful members as the reſt.* 'And I know not whether the Doctor's *modeſty* would 'propoſe, that our conſtitution ſhould be altered in this 'reſpect, or whether a much wiſer man could foreſee 'the conſequences of ſuch an alteration.'† As to their being *as uſeful members as the reſt*, I am very far from being a competent judge. It is however, pretty evident from our hiſtory, that in arbitrary reigns, and fooliſh and wicked adminiſtrations, the biſhops have commonly been *the moſt uſeful members*, or *inſtruments*, that the crown or court had, in eſtabliſhing a tyranny over the bodies and ſouls of men. But yet when Kings have croſſed

* P. 5. † p. 5. 6.

croſſed their ambitious and avaritious deſigns, they have been as forward as any men, if not more ſo, to give them diſquietude. In the words of a ſpirited writer, well verſed in matters of this ſort, 'Loyalty is not confined to the mitre. Biſhops have given more diſturbance, and occaſioned more diſtreſſes to princes and people, than any other ſet of men upon earth. This I can prove. Our own biſhops, for near an hundred years before the revolution, were in every ſcheme for promoting tyranny and bondage.' I can aſſure the gentleman, however, that my *modeſty* is much too great to *propoſe ſuch an alteration* in the conſtitution, as he ſpeaks of; tho' I know it has often been wiſhed by much *wiſer* men; and, that ſuch arguments have been uſed, as might perhaps puzzle one *near as wiſe* as himſelf to anſwer The old cry, *No biſhop, no king* has indeed been of mighty efficacy in times paſt. 'This ſolid argument, ſays one, was uſed with royal ſucceſs, by King *James* the firſt, when he ſat *deputy* for the clergy, and diſputed with the puritans, at the conference of *Hampton Court*. It was indeed the beſt he could uſe; however he ſtrengthened and embelliſhed it with ſeveral imperial oaths, which he ſwore on that occaſion, to the utter confuſion of his antagoniſts, and the great triumph of the *genuine clergy*, and the *Archbiſhop*; who beſtowed the Holy Ghoſt upon his Majeſty, for his zeal and ſwearing on the church's ſide.' Few, I believe, can ſee the *abſolute neceſſity* of biſhops having a ſeat in parliament, except biſhops themſelves, and ſuch as hope to be ſo. I am far from pretending to ſuch ſagacity, as to be able to foreſee all the conſequences of that *alteratian* in the Engliſh conſtitution, which this gentleman ſpeaks of. I fully agree with him, that a much wiſer man, could not; but even one who is ſo ſimple, might pretty eaſily foreſee and predict *ſome* of theſe pernicious conſequences: I mean particularly, that certain grave and venerable perſonages would think themſelves much injured, and, in reſentment, endeavour to throw the nation into a flame; that they would probably be for introducing a popiſh

pretender,

pretender, or for any other meaſures, however deſtructive to liberty and the proteſtant religion, in order to regain their former dignity: Which they might alſo claim *jure-divino*, with as much propriety as they do ſome other things. But if not, yet after there has been ſuch a ſolemn, ſacred ALLIANCE *between the church and the ſtate*, as has been moſt *profoundly* argued; this alteration in the conſtitution would probably be conſidered as a notorious violation of treaty; ſuch a breach of it, as would give the church a right to reſume her ſuppoſed natural *independence* and *ſupremacy*, and refuſe any longer to 'confer on the 'ſtate the *application* of the efficacy of religion, and put 'it under the magiſtrate's direction'. And who can tell which would be the greateſt looſer, the church or the ſtate, by a total diſſolution of this ancient and famous *Alliance?* from which each of them in its turn has received ſo many important advantages; and by means of which, both have been the better enabled to cruſh the proud, dangerous ſpirit of liberty and faction, hereſy and ſchiſm.——†

I agree with the gentleman in almoſt every thing which he ſays in ſeveral pages afterwards, relating to the bigotry and perſecutions of former times; and therefore paſs the whole over without any particular remarks, notwithſtanding ſome harſh cenſures of myſelf, which I find in this part of his performance. He comes to the main buſineſs, or to ſpeak about the conduct of the venerable *Society*, page 9[b]. And it is perhaps more than time, that I ſhould come to it myſelf.

The gentleman is under ſome miſtake in ſaying I own, 'that in *three* diſtricts of New-England, i. e. New-'Hampſhire, Rhode-Iſland and Providence, *much leſs* '*care hath been taken for the ſupport of a public worſhip*, 'than

† See a particular account of this *Alliance* between the church and the ſtate, and the reciprocal advantages which the high contracting Parties receive from it, in a Treatiſe upon the ſubject, by a profoundly learned critic, divine and politician, now a biſhop alſo, Dr. *Warburton*.

'than in the reſt; and that a few miſſions from the Society '*might be needed* in theſe'.*—Now Rhode-Iſland and Providence together, make but one diſtrict; I mean but one colony or government, and that, a very ſmall one; there being in all but four in New-England. In that, it was indeed acknowledged, ſome miſſions might be needed. As to New-Hampſhire, another ſmall government; tho' I ſpoke of it in the former part of the *Obſervations*, as a government in which leſs care had been taken for the ſupport of God's worſhip, than in the Maſſachuſetts and Connecticut; yet I formally corrected my own miſtake herein, page 135. Where it is ſaid, that in 'New-'Hampſhire there is a legal proviſion made for the ſup-'port of a public religion, ſimilar to that in thoſe two 'other New-England governments'. So that in the four N. England colonies, where the Society have ſo many miſſions, only one very ſmall one was actually deſtitute of a legal ſupport for proteſtant miniſters. And it ſeemed proper to ſet this matter in a true light, leſt it ſhould be ſuppoſed, from the gentleman's repreſentation, that the greater part of the New-England miſſions were in places, where I had myſelf acknowledged in effect, they were proper and needful: whereas there are near ten times ſo many in thoſe three governments, in which I ſuppoſed them needleſs, as in the ſmall colony of Rhode-Iſland, in which it was owned, there might be occaſion for them‖.

The gentleman is diſpleaſed with me for attributing to the Society a deſign to root out preſbyterianiſm, &c. from the colonies, and to introduce epiſcopacy on the ruins thereof; and for intimating, that it is partly at leaſt with this view, that they have been ſending miſſionaries to New England. [Vid. *Anſ.* p. 10, 11, &c.] Now I conceive, that I produced clear and ſufficient evidence of ſuch a deſign. One thing alledged by me to this purpoſe, was a ſtanding *Inſtruction* of the Society to their miſſionaries, *viz.*

'That

* P. 9. ‖ N.B. There is one miſſion alſo on the eaſtern frontier of the Maſſachuſetts, about 300 miles from the capital, Boſton, which is not objected againſt by me.

'That they frequently visit their respective parishioners; 'those of our own communion, to keep them steady in 'the profession and practice of religion, as taught in the 'church of England; those that oppose, or dissent from 'us, *to convince and reclaim them.*'—Upon which I made the following remarks: 'This clearly shews what they 'are after. It will also be observed here, that WE are 'considered as *parishioners* of the missionaries, no less 'than professed episcopalians: And we are often spoken 'of *as such* by them, in their letters to the Society, as ap-'pears by the *abstracts.* How *assuming* is this!'—On which occasion the gentleman exclaims, 'How *unfair* is this! 'The *Instruction* plainly relates, not to missionaries set-'tled in *presbyterian* or *congregational* parishes,--but for' (doubtless he means *to*) 'incumbents of episcopal parishes, 'tho' with a mixture of dissenters'†. But, with submission, I had a right to understand this as a *general Instruction* to all the missionaries, settled where there were any non-conformists to the church of England: As for other reasons, so particularly for this, that I found the New England missionaries understood it so themselves, and spoke of non-conformists *here*, as their parishioners. But the gentleman intimates a doubt, whether they have done so. He says, I *quote no instances of this*, and that he *remembers none*; allowing that, if they have done so, they have *expressed themselves improperly*, &c.‖ Though I before made no formal citations, to shew how *assuming* the missionaries were in this respect, he may perceive by the following, that this was not said without grounds. In the *abstract* printed 1739. p. 46. are these words: 'The 'reverend Mr. *Usher*, minister at *New Bristol*, writes, '*Sept.* 22. 1738. That *in obedience to the orders of the* '*venerable Society*, he sends a true and faithful account of 'the spiritual estate of *his parish*; there are in it a hundred 'and fifty families, reckoning about four to a family, and 'fifty of these families *are of his congregation*—The other 'hundred families consist of *dissenters of various names.*'

[N. B.

† Page 11. ‖ p. 12.

[N. B. *New-Briſtol* was then reckoned to belong to the Maſſachuſetts, but ſince to Rhode Iſland government; both of them being in New-England.] In the ſame *abſtract* and page, it is ſaid, 'The reverend Mr. *Johnſon*, miniſter 'of *Stratford* in *Connecticut* [N. E.] writes, *Oct.* 20. 1737. 'That ſince his laſt, he hath---one good family *added to his* '*church*. That there are above three hundred families in '*his pariſh*, of which ſixty-one are *of his congregation*, the 'reſt being generally *independents* or *congregationaliſts*,' &c. It is needleſs to quote other *abſtracts* for my vindication in this reſpect, tho' it were eaſy. The miſſionaries certainly knew, that there were no legal epiſcopal *pariſhes* in New-England; and yet they write in this manner about their *diſſenting pariſhioners*. Let me alſo remark, that the Society, by quoting with apparent approbation, ſuch extracts from the letters of their New-England miſſionaries, ſeem themſelves to conſider US as their pariſhioners, and therefore among thoſe perſons, whom they are inſtructed *frequently to viſit*, in order to *convince and reclaim them*. The impartial are now left to judge, whether this gentleman had good reaſon to accuſe me of *unfairneſs*, either for ſaying that the miſſionaries were *aſſuming* in this reſpect; or for arguing from the aforeſaid *Inſtruction*, compared with ſuch letters, and the uſe made of them, that the Society as well as they, had it partly in their deſign, to proſelyte the New-England congregationaliſts, &c. to the church of England. To charge me with a *miſtake*, is one thing; to charge me with *unfairneſs*, is another, which I take unkindly; and, I conceive, he had no good reaſon for either, in the preſent caſe.

To prove that the Society had the deſign aforeſaid, I alſo produced a paſſage from the hiſtorical *Account* of the Society, 1706, which I conſidered as little or nothing ſhort of a formal declaration from themſelves, that what they had in view, in ſending miſſionaries into theſe American colonies, was not merely providing for the people of their own communion, (as this gentleman would perſwade us) but alſo making proſelytes to the church of England. The gentleman ſays, he hath 'not been able to procure this

'*Account*, or to learn by whom, or whoſe order it was com-
'piled'.† This is ſomewhat ſtrange, from a perſon who ſometimes ſpeaks as a member of the Society, and one who has had *recourſe* to its books and records on this occaſion. The ſaid *Account* itſelf is ſo very advantageous to the Society, as to leave but little room for doubt in this reſpect. It appears to have been compiled and publiſhed by order, and in the name of the Society; particularly from the laſt page---'Thus have WE given a true and faithful *Account* 'of the Society---And WE publiſh it to the world, not for 'oſtentation of what has been done,---but to ſhew what a 'mighty truſt is committed to US; how ſincerely WE 'have endeavoured to diſcharge it; how willing WE are 'to labor in the proſecution of it; and how much WE 'want a farther aſſiſtance and ſupply from *all good and* '*pious chriſtians*, who may depend on a juſt diſpoſal of 'their charity, in promoting the beſt deſign in the world, 'that of the *converſion of ſouls*, by the *propagation of the* '*goſpel*,' &c. Beſides, the Society formally adopted this *Account* ſix years after its publication. For in the *abſtract* 1712. p. 44. they ſay: 'The Society apprehending that 'nothing would more effectually tend to juſtify their good 'endeavours, and to promote the ſucceſs of them, than to 'inform the world of their foundation, eſtabliſhment and 'continual progreſs; did agree, "That the book called "*An Account of the Society for propagating the Goſpel*, &c. "1706, 4to, ſhould be reprinted, with a continuation down "to the preſent time."

But the gentleman thinks that the paſſage to which I referred, in this *Account*, is not to my purpoſe. He aſſigns two reaſons for this, of the force of which the reader will judge, after I have cited the paſſage more at large, as follows:---'It was the unhappineſs of New-England and the 'adjoining parts, to be firſt planted and inhabited by per-'ſons who were *generally diſaffected* to the church by law 'eſtabliſht in England, and had many of them taken refuge 'or retirement in thoſe parts, on account of their ſuffer-'ing for non-conformity here at home. So that they fell

'*thers*

† p. 12.

'*there generally* into *independent congregations*: And there 'was no face of the church of England till about the year '1679, when upon queſtioning the charter of that coun-'try, the lord biſhop of London, upon an addreſs from 'ſeveral of the inhabitants of Boſton, did prevail with 'his Majeſty, that a church ſhould be allowed in that town, 'for the exerciſe of religion according to the church of 'England, towards the maintenance of which, his late 'Majeſty King *William* was pleaſed to ſettle an annual 'bounty of one hundred pounds a year, which is ſtill 'continued, and two miniſters are now ſupported in it. 'Several other ways of diviſion and ſeparation did ſo much 'obtain in other of our colonies and plantations, that this 'made it *more neceſſary* to think of providing for a regular 'and orthodox miniſtry to be ſent and ſettled amongſt 'them; to remove thoſe prejudices, under which the 'people *generally laboured*, and to promote, *as much as* '*poſſible, an agreement in faith and worſhip*, in order to the 'recommending our holy religion to unbelievers.'† The gentleman's firſt objection againſt the argument which I drew from this paſſage, relative to the deſign of the Society, in ſending miſſionaries to New-England, is, That it *expreſly ſpeaks, not of independent or any congregations in New-England, but of* other ways *of diviſion and ſeparation in* other colonies, *and therefore is nothing to my purpoſe.*‖ Now if that part of the paſſage, which I before quoted in form, does not ſpeak expreſly of *New-England*, or of independent, or any other congregations *here*; yet ſurely the gentleman will not deny, but that as it is here more largely cited, it ſpeaks expreſly of theſe alſo: Let the reader review the former part of it, if he doubts. The gentleman's other objection is thus expreſſed: 'Beſides, 'that *as much agreement as poſſible, in faith and worſhip*, 'might be far *leſs than a general conformity to the church* '*of England*; which it might be *impoſſible* to obtain,' &c.‡ How very acute and ſubtle a way of reaſoning is this? Becauſe it might in fact be found *impoſſible*, or *impracticable*, to reduce the people in theſe colonies to a general

 conformity

† *Account*, p. 10, 11. ‖ *Anſ.* p. 12. ‡ Ibid.

conformity to the church of England; therefore the Society had never any deſign to do this; but to do *juſt ſo much as*, and *no more than, was poſſible!* Nothing but making the trial, and ſeeing the event, could ſhew them whether it was, or was not *poſſible*, to effect a general uniformity of religion in theſe colonies. Surely this might be in their view and deſign, while it remained, as it ſtill remains, doubtful, whether it be practicable or not. And the expreſſion uſed in the paſſage aforeſaid, *to promote, as much as poſſible, an agreement in faith and worſhip*, moſt naturally conveys the ſenſe which I put upon it: Eſpecially when the words immediately preceeding, are conſidered;—*a regular and orthodox miniſtry to be ſent and ſettled amongſt them, to remove thoſe* prejudices, *under which the people* generally *laboured, and to promote*, &c. And does not this plainly relate, not only to *other ways of diviſion and ſeparation in other colonies;* but alſo to the *way* of the New-Englanders, who, as it was before obſerved, were *generally diſaffected to the church, and fell generally into independent congregations?* It cannot be reaſonably doubted.

Beſides, Dr. *Bearcroft*, the ſecretary of the Society, and who is ſuppoſed to have been throughly initiated into all its myſteries, does in effect avow this deſign which I am ſpeaking of, in his ſermon before the Society, publiſhed by its order. He laments, that tho' the government in New-England had indeed *taken care for God's publick worſhip, and erecting ſchools for the education of youth;* yet this was *not according to the true orthodox principles of the church of England.* And, after ſpeaking of their charity in attempting to bring back their brethren in America to *good manners*, &c. how does he glory in it, that 'the *word of God* mightily grows and prevails in 'New-England, *according to the liturgy*'—? Both the conduct of the Society's miſſionaries here, and many of their letters publiſhed in the *Abſtracts*, clearly ſhew that they conſider it is one principal part of their buſineſs, in compaſſing ſea and land, *to make proſelytes* from among us. And though it were allowed, that the Society had it really

really much at heart, that we ſhould be *convinced* and *reclaimed*, and all become epiſpopalians; yet it would not be eaſy to ſhew what methods they could have uſed, more adapted to, and more clearly declarative of, ſuch a deſign, than thoſe which they have actually taken. Neither Mr. *Apthorp*, nor my very *candid* (N. England) *Examiner*, ſo far as I can at preſent recollect, pretended to diſown that the Society actually had this deſign; but ſeemed rather to juſtify it, as what the Society had a right to attempt, if not by the moſt obvious ſcope of their charter, yet by virtue of the diſcretionary power therein granted. And it is well known that many epiſcopalians among us, have aſſerted this to have been one primary, original deſign of the Inſtitution; being, as I ſuppoſe, aſhamed either to deny a thing ſo manifeſt, as that the Society were actually endeavouring to accompliſh it, or that they had not good authority to do ſo, by their charter.

Now, can it be ſuppoſed that my *unknown Anſwerer*'s aſſertions, that the Society have not been endeavouring to promote a general conformity among us to the church of England, ſufficient to counter-balance the evidence of ſuch a deſign, ariſing from the words of their own *Account*, from the *Inſtruction* aforeſaid, from Dr. *Bearcroft*'s ſermon, from the practices of the miſſionaries, and their letters to the Society, by which it appears that they look on the making proſelytes, as a material part of their buſineſs, if not the greateſt of their merit? In ſuch a caſe as this, the aſſertion of an unknown perſon will not be ſufficient with impartial men. Nothing ſhort of the Society's direct, formal diſavowal of ſuch an intention, is ſufficient to over-balance the joint evidence of it, reſulting from all circumſtances. And indeed, this evidence is ſo ſtrong, that I do not believe they will ever riſque any part of their reputation, by declaring that they have not had this, at leaſt partly in their view, in ſending ſo large a proportion of their miſſionaries into New-England.

But the gentleman (after mentioning ſomething which Dr. *Johnſon* and Mr. *Beach* have ſaid upon this ſubject) adds, that *a very reſpectable miſſionary* uſes the following words,

words, in a paper *not printed*, but which he hath ſeen, *viz.* 'I believe very few inſtances, if any, can be produced of 'any miſſionaries beginning with any diſſenter, with a 'view of reclaiming him to the church. I have long 'known the affairs of the Society, and know of no ſuch 'inſtance.'† The paper here cited, and ſaid not to be *printed*, is doubtleſs the ſame that was publiſhed in Boſton ſome time ago, under the title of *A letter to a friend, containing a ſhort vindication of the Society*, &c. *By one of its Members*; and annexed to a rather more virulent performance, called, by a uſual catachreſis, *A candid Examination*: For the paſſage which the gentleman cites, is in page 82d of that abuſive pamphlet. Whoever the *very reſpectable* miſſionary was, that wrote ſaid *Letter*, it ſeems he had too much regard for his reputation, to prefix his *name* to, or ſubſcribe it, when publiſhed here. My remarks upon this *Letter*, and particularly upon this paſſage, may be ſeen by thoſe who think it worth while, in my *Defence* of the *Obſervations*, Sect. 12. Where there is a brief account of Mr. commiſſary *Price*'s managements, in order to build up the church of England at *Hopkinton*. It is really aſtoniſhing that any gentleman will pretend to ſay, the miſſionaries do not endeavour to make proſelytes from our churches; tho' it would not be ſtrange if they were, if poſſible, even more ſolicitous than they are, to conceal the mean and ſcandalous methods which they ſometimes take to that end; and, I believe, not ſeldom. The aforeſaid commiſſary's behaviour is a flagrant example. And ſince publiſhing that account, I have received ſuch farther informations as render it almoſt impoſſible not to believe, that the Society knew ſomething of that unhappy man's vile conduct, even when they confirmed him as a miſſionary at *Hopkinton*; tho' I can truly ſay, it gives me great pain to make a ſuppoſition, which appears ſo highly diſhonourable to that venerable body.

Let me now add, upon good authority, tho' not upon my own knowledge, that other New-England miſſionaries have received, not to ſay courted, to their communion, perſons

† *Anſ.* p. 15.

perſons under cenſure in our churches for their diſorderly and unchriſtian practices, before and without any ſatisfaction given: And that being applied to, and expoſtulated with by the congregational miniſters of theſe churches, the ſaid miſſionaries have anſwered to this effect, that they received theſe perſons as never having belonged to, or been ſubject to the diſcipline of, any *chriſtian* churches; they conſidering us as very little, if at all better than mere heathens. And one of theſe zealous miſſionaries, as I am credibly informed, went to preach to ſome people at a diſtance, who were inclining to the church of England, but ſtill commonly attended the public worſhip and ordinances in our way: But there being no epiſcopal church then in the town where they lived, the congregational miniſter and people very readily obliged them, on this occaſion, with the uſe of the *meeting-houſe*, in which ſaid miſſionary accordingly preached. And on his taking leave of them, to make a ſuitable return for the civility ſhewn him, and to diſcover *what ſpirit he was of*, he adviſed the people aforeſaid, by no means any more to attend the public worſhip with diſſenters, as they had hitherto done; but rather to tarry at home upon the Lord's day, when there was no epiſcopal miniſter to preach to them. If I am called upon, I intend to mention *names*; and give a more particular narrative of theſe tranſactions—— If theſe are real facts, can it be pretended that the miſſionaries do not endeavour to make proſelytes from our churches? or can it be thought ſtrange, if we are much diſguſted at ſuch uncharitable and unchriſtian behaviour towards us?

The gentleman diſlikes what I ſaid of the church newly ſet up at Cambridge; particularly, *that ſcarce ten families in that town uſually attend the ſervice of the church.* This was ſtrictly true; and I challenge any perſon to mention more ſuch families, on penalty of his being publicly expoſed. But then the gentleman ſays, 'it 'was repreſented to the Society that 50 families in the 'town and *neighbourhood* were deſirous to attend it. † He

† Page 16.

He ſpeaks to the ſame purpoſe reſpecting the number of petitioners to the Society, in other places, in oppoſition to what I intimated. And indeed I have reaſon to think, it has been the common way, to get as many names as poſſible to the petitions ſent home; the names of perſons living at 20 or 30 miles diſtance from the propoſed ſeat of the miſſions; and of ſome, who lived in towns where there were already epiſcopal miniſters; as in the dirty affair of commiſſary *Price* at Hopkinton. So that the Society has been greatly impoſed on, being made to believe that all the petitioners lived within ſuch a diſtance, that they could ordinarily and conveniently attend the ſervice of the church. As to Cambridge, the caſe was briefly and plainly this: There were five or ſix gentlemen of figure, each of whoſe income, it is commonly ſuppoſed, was ſo large, as to have admitted of his maintaining a *domeſtic chaplain;* there not being as many more epiſcopalian families in ſaid town. Thoſe gentlemen uſed ſometimes to come to Boſton to church, in their coaches or chariots; at others, to attend the public worſhip in the congregational church in Cambridge, I preſume without *hurting their conſciences* by doing ſo. But preferring the church of England, for what reaſons I will not gueſs, leſt I ſhould not *hit right*, they were deſirous to have a church built, and a miſſionary fixed there. Subſcribers were to be procured; and, *very opportunely*, there was a diſagreement in a neighbouring town,‡ about the place of ſetting up a new *Meeting-Houſe*: This difference was the means of procuring ſome; where or who the reſt were, I know not. But I am well informed, whatever was repreſented to the Society, that there are not commonly at that church, in the winter ſeaſon, more than 20 *perſons*, ſometimes not more than 10; and in the ſummer, not more than 30 or 40, except upon ſome extraordinary occaſions. If I am miſinformed in any of theſe points, I am willing, and even deſirous to be ſet right: If not, let the world judge, whether fixing a church and miſſionary at Cambridge, one of the moſt ancient towns of New-England, and

‡ Watertown.

and within about a quarter of a mile of the congregational meeting-houſe, is conformable to the true intent of the Society's charter; or whether, ſuppoſing them to be appriſed of the true ſtate and circumſtances of things, their continuing to ſupport a miſſionary there, would not diſcover a *deſign* different from that, which this gentleman would have us think the true and only one;—a deſign to encourage, ſtrengthen and increaſe a party.

The gentleman thinks I had no juſt cauſe for ſaying, that the *epiſcopalians affect to reproach us under the name of* independents. He ſays Mr. *Neal*, himſelf an *independent* calls us ſo; that it is 'proper, and not reproachful at all.'§ Whatever Mr. *Neal* might be, or ſay, our churches have all along diſowned that *title*. Their *platform* of church diſcipline expreſly diſclaims it: † And while we declare our diſlike of it, we may well conſider it as a term of contempt and reproach, at leaſt as it is often uſed by epiſcopalians. But enough of this.

I ſee no reaſon, from any thing this gentleman has ſaid in ſeveral pages, ‡ to change my opinion about the *motives* which *generally* induce people among us, to go over to the church of England: And I know who, and *what ſort* of perſons they are, at leaſt as well as he can be ſuppoſed to do. However, I never denied, but that ſome of them could truly plead *conſcience* in the caſe. He ſays I extend the poſſibility of this no farther than to allow, that there may be *ſome things or circumſtances* [in our way of worſhip,&c.] *which they cannot entirely acquieſce in or approve of*. This language I made uſe of, as being in effect the ſame that the preſent Archbiſhop of Canterbury uſed in his ſermon before the Society, as quoted by Mr. *Apthorp*. For one thing which he ſummoned his Grace to bear *teſtimony* to, was, that in the leaſt exceptionable of our chriſtian aſſemblies, there were *ſome things which the conſciences of many could not* 'acquieſce in.' [Vid. *Conſiderations*, London Edit. p. 162.] The gentleman ſays, 'Without maintaining *they* '[the people of New-England] *have no goſpel miniſters, or*

ſacraments,

§ p. 17. † See the atteſtation to Dr. *C. Mather*'s *Ratio diſciplinæ fratrum Nov-Anglorum*. ‡ p. 18---22.

'*ſacraments, or ordinances, or churches*, we *may* apprehend, 'whether juſtly or not, is not to be now diſputed, that epiſ-'copacy is of apoſtolical inſtitution,' &c. It is true, they *may* apprehend ſo; for what are not people capable of ſuppoſing, however groundleſs. He adds: 'We *may* ap-'prehend that after the ceaſing of *extraordinary* ſpiritual 'gifts, *forms* of prayer were alſo uſed, more or leſs, thro'-'out the church of Chriſt, and are needful for the obſer-'vance of the ſcripture rule, *Let all things be done decent-'ly and in order.*' This alſo they *may apprehend.* But if thoſe *extraordinary gifts* ceaſed as early as Dr. *Middleton*, and many others ſuppoſe, I preſume the gentleman can bring no proof, that forms of prayer were introduced from that time, or even 'till long afterwards. As to the *ſcripture rule* which the gentleman ſpeaks of, reſpecting *decency* and *order*; if forms of prayer may be ſuppoſed to come under it, ſo as to be *needful for the obſervance thereof*; why may not the ſign of the croſs alſo? Why may not ſquare caps, or any uſages in the worſhip of God, which fanciful men think conducive to order and decency? Where will people ſtop in introducing their own inventions, in this lax way of expounding ſcripture rules? or what bounds will be ſet to their cenſoriouſneſs, if they allow themſelves to cenſure thoſe, who decline the uſe of any uninſtituted modes and forms, which they conceive to be decent and orderly? I am, indeed, myſelf far from being zealous againſt all forms of prayer, as ſuch: But to ſuppoſe they are neceſſary, that God cannot be orderly and decently worſhipped without them, or that it is ſinful to decline them, is highly unreaſonable and ſuperſtitious.

I do not think myſelf concerned particularly to conſider the ſeveral cauſes, to which the gentleman aſcribes the growth of the church of England among us. He mentions one, however, which I cannot but take a curſory notice of. He ſays, that when the epiſpopalians among us were *attacked* and *reproached* for their religious principles, *it was natural that they ſhould endeavour to defend themſelves, and procure ſuch books as would enable them to do it better.* He immediately adds; 'Some of the *more candid* and *inquiſi-'tive* among the presbyterians and congregationaliſts *adven-'tured* to hear their defences, and to read their authors; were

'were convinced by them, and became churchmen*.' So that, according to this gentleman, the proſelytes to the church of England here, have been ſome of our *moſt candid, inquiſitive* and *bookiſh* men; ſuch as have taken the moſt pains to underſtand the merits of the controverſy! Doubtleſs he takes his information in this reſpect, from the good miſſionaries, who had a right to ſpeak as they tho't. I have the ſame right; and accordingly declare, from what I have obſerved, that I ſuppoſe very few inquiſitive perſons, or ſtudiers of this controverſy among us, have become churchmen in conſequence thereof. Some ſuch there may have been; but, I believe, theſe proſelytes have much more generally been young and thoughtleſs perſons; the volatile and unſtable; ſuch as had but a very moderate ſhare of underſtanding, or but little ſobriety; and who hardly ever read a book in their lives, really with a view to inform themſelves about the true ſtate of this controverſy—But it is not worth while to diſpute about ſuch things as do not, in their nature, admit of a deciſion on either ſide; eſpecially ſuch as have little relation to the preſent argument.

Wherefore,

To come directly to the main point; the gentleman acknowledges 'that the caſe of the *New-England epiſco-* 'palians, is not particularly deſcribed and provided for in 'the [Society's] charter'†. I conclude he means, what is certainly true, that the charter does not expreſly make proviſion for ſupplying with epiſcopal miniſters, perſons in ſuch circumſtances as they are; or people who live ſcattered here and there, in towns of non conforming proteſtants, where due proviſion is made for the adminiſtration of God's word and ordinances, after the presbyterian or congregational mode. I cannot ſuppoſe he intended only to acknowledge, that New-England and the epiſcopalians here, are not mentioned by name in the charter; or that their caſe is not very largely and particularly ſpoken of therein. This would be ſaying nothing of conſequence: For neither is any other particular colony, or country, or the people therein, thus provided for in expreſs terms. But then the thing inſiſted on, as I conceive with great reaſon, is, that tho' the charter does not diſtinguiſh the

* Pag. 22. † Pag 23.

colonies by name, ſaying that the epiſcopalians in *this* or *that*, ſhall be provided for, but not thoſe in *others*; yet it is ſo expreſſed, as to amount to the ſame thing. For it deſcribes the religious circumſtances of thoſe places and people, which were to be relieved, as deſtitute of the *adminiſtration of God's word and ſacraments*, &c. Now, if the epiſcopalians in ſome of the plantations are actually in ſuch a ſtate; but thoſe in others of them, whether the New-England colonies, or any other, are not; it may be properly ſaid, that the charter *expreſly* makes proviſion for the former, but no for the latter; not even by *implication*, or any juſt *conſtruction*. That the New-England epiſcopalians were not in ſuch a deſtitute condition, is evident: Nor can this gentleman conſiſtently ſay they were. Whatever he may think about the apoſtolic inſtitution of epiſcopacy, or the antiquity and uſefulneſs of liturgies; yet he does not ſpeak of theſe, as eſſential to the being of chriſtian churches: He has far too much candor and good ſenſe, to ſuppoſe them ſo. And ſpeaking of us congregationaliſts, he ſays expreſly, 'Without maintaining that 'they have *no goſpel miniſters, or ſacraments, or ordinances, 'or churches*, we may apprehend,' &c. We have a right to conſider this as a conceſſion from him, that tho' we reject epiſcopacy, the liturgy, and peculiar rites and uſages of the church of England, yet we have ſtill truly *goſpel miniſters, ſacraments, ordinances and churches*. And if ſo, no perſons inhabiting theſe parts, whether epiſcopalians or others, can juſtly be ſaid to *lack, want* or to be *deſtitute* thereof; and for that reaſon, in danger of falling into *atheiſm* or *infidelity*, or *popiſh ſuperſtition* and *idolatry*. So that, by his own conceſſion, it appears that the charter makes no proviſion, whether expreſly or implicitly, for ſupporting epiſcopal miſſionaries in theſe parts, for the ſake of the few epiſcopalians living among us.

The gentleman, having acknowledged that the caſe of the New-England epiſcopalians *is not particularly deſcribed and provided for in the charter*, endeavours to guard againſt any uſe that might be made of this conceſſion, to the prejudice of his argument; which is not ſtrange. But I a little wonder at the method he has taken, to this End: For he immediately ſubjoins— 'But ſo neither is the caſe of any 'other

'other *Indians*, than ſuch as are the King's *ſubjects, and* 'people living in his plantations and colonies; for to theſe 'only the letter of the charter extends,' &c. And yet the gentleman ſays, I am *ſo far from blaming the Society for applying part of their benefactions to the inſtruction of ſuch* Indians *as only border on his Majeſty's dominions, that I blame them greatly for not applying more of it* (he meant *them*) *to that uſe.* He goes on to argue, that the caſe of the N. England epiſcopalians may *much more be looked on as comprehended within the intention of the charter*, than the caſe of the ſaid bordering Indians*. But theſe caſes are by no means ſo nearly parallel, as they are ſuppoſed to be, by this way of reaſoning. For tho' neither theſe epiſcopalians, nor the ſaid Indians, are *in terms* provided for, or even mentioned in the charter, (in which reſpect they are on the ſame footing) yet the Indians very fairly, and moſt obviouſly come within the intent of it; but the others do not. Theſe Indians are unqueſtionably deſtitute of *God's word* and *ſacraments*; many of thoſe only bordering on our colonies, have actually profeſſed themſelves, and been for a long time treated with, as the King's *ſubjects*; and beſides, the charter expreſly authorizes the Society to uſe their beſt endeavours to *propagate the goſpel in thoſe parts*, where the King has any plantations, &c. Which clauſe has all along, and on all hands, been conſidered as having a ſpecial reference to the Indians, not only within the limits of the Britiſh colonies, but bordering on them. There is then, no room for doubt, but that the Society act conformably, not only to the true deſign, but even to the expreſſion of the charter, in uſing means in order to their converſion: Since tho' theſe Indians *themſelves* are not particularly mentioned, yet *their caſe* is expreſly provided for. This is not applicable to the epiſcopalians among us: Neither *themſelves* are mentioned, nor *their caſe* provided for, either expreſly, or by juſt implication; they not being deſtitue of the adminiſtration of God's word and ordinances. And, indeed, this gentleman, in order to vindicate the Society in ſending miſſionaries to them, is forced to have recourſe to the plea of a *large diſcretionary power* veſted in them; ſo large, as to allow of their *making alterations in their inſtitution*: For this poſition

* Ibid.

ſition of Mr. *Apthorp* he endeavours to palliate and defend*. He ſays, 'the rules of law require that grants of princes, 'and particularly grants in favor of religion, be interpreted 'as *liberally as may be*.'† Agreed: But ſtill it may be doubted, whether it is not to interpret this particular grant *more liberally* than may [juſtly] be, to ſuppoſe the Society empowered to *alter* their inſtitution, and to make proviſion for thoſe, for whom the charter makes none. And having recourſe to this argument, ſhews a conſciouſneſs, at leaſt that ſuch a conduct is not *eaſily* and *naturally* reconciled with the charter: For if it were, ſurely the defenders of the Society would not plead for ſo extraordinary a power, or ſo very *liberal* a way of interpretation. Beſides, this is really prejudicial, not advantageous to religion, in *favor* of which, as is hinted, the charter was granted.

The gentleman himſelf does not appear to be intirely ſatisfied with this, which he calls an argument *à fortiori*. He therefore attempts, in the next place, to juſtify the Society, as to theſe miſſions, by the very expreſſions of the original charter. Referring to a clauſe of which, he ſays; 'Now 'muſt not they who lack ſupport for ſuch miniſters, as 'they can with a *good conſcience* attend, *want the admini-* '*ſtration of God's word and ſacraments*,'&c?† This he applies to the New England epiſcopalians, in order to bring them within the deſign of the charter. Several things were ſaid upon this point, firſt in the *Obſervations*, and then in the *Defence* of them. Let it now be farther remarked, that if theſe epiſcopalians could properly be ſaid to *lack* the adminiſtration of God's word and ſacraments, they would come, not only within the deſign, but, in ſome ſort, within the letter of the charter; ſince it *expreſly* provides for ſuch of his Majeſty's ſubjects in the colonies, as *lack the adminiſtration*, &c. Whereas the gentleman, before, *ſeemed* at leaſt to allow, that the charter did not make proviſion for the caſe of theſe people. But not to inſiſt on this conceſſion at preſent, I think theſe people cannot be properly ſaid to *want* the adminiſtration, &c. upon his own ſuppoſition, but to *decline* and *diſapprove* of it. For he does not deny, but that we have *goſpel miniſters*, *ſacraments*, *ordinances* and *churches* here; of which they might enjoy the benefit, in common

* Pag. 24. † Ibid.

common with their chriſtian brethren, if they *choſe* to do ſo. How then could the epiſcopalians among us, though there were no epiſcopal churches here, be properly ſaid, in the general terms of the charter, to *want*, or *lack*, the adminiſtration of God's word and ſacraments? If there had been any thing in the charter, to ſhew that it meant the adminiſtration of God's word, &c. according to the particular uſage of the church of England, in oppoſition to, or diſtinction from, all other proteſtant churches, as well as that of Rome; it is readily acknowledged, that this reaſoning would be good. But this is not the caſe. What may be juſtly ſaid of theſe epiſcopalians, is, that they *diſlike*, and therefore will not attend on, the adminiſtration of God's word and ſacraments in our way: Which is quite a different thing from ſaying, that they *want*, or are *deſtitute* thereof. The difference is as great, as between a man's *lacking* daily food, and *refuſing* that which is before him, becauſe it is not cooked and diſhed up *a la mode*, or in a manner to pleaſe his fancy.

To ſay that the epiſcopalians here, cannot with a *good conſcience* attend upon our miniſters and their adminiſtrations; and therefore that they *want* the adminiſtration of God's word and ſacraments, is by no means ſatisfactory. As to the fact itſelf, that they cannot in *conſcience* attend upon them; I do not believe there is one in an hundred of them, who has ever declared, or that will *ſeriouſly* declare, that he thinks it *ſinful* to do ſo. They may generally, in their judgment, be it right or wrong, *prefer* the worſhip and communion of the church of England to ours; and therefore think themſelves bound in *conſcience*, when both are in their power, uſually to attend the former, as more for *their* edification. This they may be ſuppoſed to do, and in that reſpect be juſtifiable in their conformity to the church of England, tho' it were allowed that they do not think it abſolutely unlawful or criminal to worſhip in our way, or to have communion with us in chriſtian ordinances; and could therefore do ſo with a *good conſcience*, if there were no epiſcopal churches in theſe parts. I know, ſome of the weaker, the more bigotted and cenſorious ſort of them, declare that they could not in *conſcience* do this: But of the far greater part of them, I have not ſo ill an opinion. Nor have I any reaſon to think that, in their applications to the

Society

Society for miſſionaries, they have commonly made uſe of this plea ; or gone any farther than to declare in general, their approbation and choice of the church of England communion, as moſt for their edification : Which is a very different thing from ſuppoſing ours abſolutely unlawful and ſinful.

If I am right in what I have here ſuggeſted, this argument, drawn from *conſcience*, is of no force, being grounded on a falſe ſuppoſition. But allowing that theſe epiſcopalians are generally ſo ſimple, bigotted or ſuperſtitious, that they cannot with a *good conſcience* attend upon God's word and ſacraments with us, as this gentleman ſeems to ſuppoſe ; tho' they may be real objects of pity and compaſſion, it appears not that they have any right to expect relief from the Society, their caſe not being provided for in the charter, nor coming within the general deſign of the Inſtitution : Which, plainly, was not the aſſiſtance of proteſtants of any particular denomination, living ſcattered among greater numbers of other proteſtants, where proviſion was made for the ſupport of miniſters, and the adminiſtration of God's word and ordinances ; but *only* for perſons deſtitute of theſe advantages. The Scottiſh Society is of the two leſs limitted by its charter, than this in England. And yet if the ſaid Society ſhould annually expend perhaps a third part of their revenue, in ſupporting, I will not now add, *increaſing*, the presbyterian party, in thoſe plantations where the worſhip of God is duly provided for, according to the church of England, and proportionably neglect people who were actually deſtitute of God's word and ſacraments in every proteſtant form ; epiſcopalians would, without doubt, univerſally exclaim againſt this, as an abuſe and miſapplication of their charitable fund ; and as diſcovering too great a fondneſs for a party, or particular ſect of proteſtants. Their pleading that the presbyterians, provided for by them, could not with a *good conſcience* acquieſce in, or conform to the church of England, would, I am perſuaded, be of very little weight with epiſcopalians. Nor can any man ſhew why this way of reaſoning is not as juſt, when applied to the epiſcopal Society in England, as when applied to the presbyterian Society in Scotland. The church of England is no more the eſtabliſhed religion in one part of Britain,

Britain, than the kirk is in the other; King *William* was equally King of both parts; a charter conceived in the identical terms with that we are ſpeaking of, would have anſwered as well for a presbyterian, as for an epiſcopal Society, only the names and titles of the Grantees being changed: though ſome of theſe were actually presbyterians. Nor does it appear that the Grantor had it any more in his royal intention, that epiſcopalians in ſuch circumſtances as are here ſuppoſed, ſhould be provided for, than that presbyterians ſhould, in the like circumſtances. From whence it may be concluded, that he either deſigned both, or neither: Let this gentleman make his choice——

But if there are numbers of epiſcopalians among us, who cannot with a *good conſcience* hold communion with our churches in goſpel ordinances, it may be aſked, What is to be done? is there no regular way of relief for them? I anſwer, the ſame, and no other than there would be for presbyterians or congregationaliſts in the like caſe. If their numbers and abilities are ſuch, that they can ſupport epiſcopal miniſters for themſelves, they not only have a right, but ought to do it. Or if they can make ſuch repreſentations of their caſe, (which, on the aforeſaid ſuppoſition, is really an unhappy one) as to induce charitable people, in their *private* capacity, to give them aſſiſtance, no one will object againſt it. But if they can do neither of theſe things, there appears no *regular* way of relief for them; they muſt patiently ſubmit to the providence of God, who has placed them in ſuch circumſtances; waiting, either till *more light* removes their miſtakes and prejudices, or till their numbers and abilities are ſufficiently increaſed, to ſupport ſuch miniſters as they chuſe to have. A Society incorporated for different purpoſes, (not for the ſupport of any particular proteſtant ſect, as ſuch) has no right to provide for them, to the neglect of ſuch perſons as are indiſputably the proper objects of their inſtitution.

But the gentleman, after obſerving that the Society was incorporated, primarily, to prevent the King's ſubjects falling into *atheiſm* or *infidelity*, or into *popiſh ſuperſtition* and *idolatry*, ſays: 'Now doth not the Dr. think the epiſcopalians, 'when they have no miniſters in whoſe miniſtrations they 'can acquieſce, muſt be *grievouſly liable* to the one or the

other *? Upon which let me obſerve, as to thoſe who are epiſcopalians upon principle, or thoſe people ſpoken of by this gentleman, who cannot with a *good conſcience* worſhip God with us; that they muſt be ſuppoſed, at leaſt by epiſcopalians, to be converſant in the holy ſcriptures, ſerious believers of them, devout worſhippers of God in their houſes, and real, practical chriſtians. Now ſuch perſons as theſe, perſons of ſo tender a *conſcience*, cannot ſurely be thought in any imminent danger of apoſtatizing into *atheiſm* or *infidelity*; eſpecially as they have the *common-prayer-book* to aſſiſt them in their daily private devotions, and other *pious* books, not to ſay the Bible, to read and meditate on. Can ſuch chriſtians as the gentleman ſuppoſes our epiſcopalians to be, and living in a chriſtian land, where the public worſhip of God is upheld, be *grievouſly liable* to turn atheiſts or infidels, even tho' they cannot acquieſce in our way of worſhip? I think not; and therefore, that the N. England miſſions cannot be vindicated upon this footing. I hope this gentleman will not, for the ſake of his argument, deny the epiſcopalians here to be ſuch good chriſtians as he has all along ſuppoſed them; or ſay that they have ſo little knowledge or ſobriety, that they are already on the brink of infidelity and atheiſm; ſo that, being without ſuch miniſters as they can attend, they would be *grievouſly liable* ſoon to plunge into that horrible gulph. This would be, for the ſake of his logic, *grievouſly* to reproach thoſe, whoſe cauſe he is pleading. Beſides, if they are ſuppoſed to be ſuch a profligate ſort of people, and ſo void of *conſcience*, the argument which he draws from their ſuppoſed *conſcientious* non-compliance with our way of worſhip, would be at once overthrown: It would deſtroy itſelf, by its own inconſiſtency; and, indeed, taken any way, his reaſoning is ſelf-repugnant.

But ſome of theſe good, conſcientious people, it is ſaid, are grievouſly liable, if not to *atheiſm* and *infidelity*, yet to *popiſh ſuperſtition* and *idolatry*. 'Particularly,' adds the gentleman, 'muſt not thoſe of them be in great danger of 'popery who, as he [*meaning myſelf*] tells us, prefer that 'to the worſhip of the prevailing party in N. England †? Let me obſerve, that I did not ſuppoſe there was a *great* number

* Pag. 25. † Ibid.

number of epiſcopalians here, ſo deeply prejudiced againſt us, or who think ſo favourably of the maſs. Suppoſing there may be 20 or 30 ſuch perſons in N. England, ſcattered over a country of 3 or 400 miles in extent, can this be thought a ſubſtantial reaſon for ſupporting 20 or 30 miſſions here, at a great expence? eſpecially when it is conſidered, that there are here no popiſh prieſts or emiſſaries known of, further to pervert, and to confirm them papiſts; but many people to diſſwade them from thoſe errors, and all worldly motives on the other ſide. There is no reaſon to think that the Society ever had the caſe of theſe N. England *high-flyers* in their mind, or conſequently, that they have ſent the more miſſionaries hither on their account. And if not, this cannot be properly uſed as an argument to juſtify their ſending them. I can hardly think the gentleman is in earneſt, or thinks it a ſolid one. He ſeems to have laid hold on what I ſaid of ſome few of the more bigotted epiſcopalians among us, (whether he believed it or not, I cannot tell) as a plauſible pretext for ſupporting miſſions here. But the Society have *apparently* acted upon different principles, with other views and motives; not to keep the people of N. England from turning *roman-catholick*, *deiſts* and *atheiſts*; (of all which there now is, and ever was, much leſs danger than of the people of London doing ſo.) but to ſupport and ſtrengthen the epiſcopal party, and gradually to bring us into the boſom of the church; or, in the language of their own *Account*, 'to remove thoſe *prejudices*, 'under which the people generally laboured, & to promote, '*as much as poſſible, an agreement in faith and worſhip*.'—

Let me add, that this plea of *conſcience*, as it has of late years been uſed by the defenders of the Society's numerous miſſions in theſe parts, is the leſs ſatisfactory upon this account: There would, in all probability, have been hardly any of theſe *ſcrupulous* people among us at this day, had it not been for the Society; and if the miſſions were withdrawn, 'tis likely the far greater part of them might ſoon return to the communion of our churches. Is it reaſonable that the Society, when there was but a handful of theſe people, as one may ſay, in all N. England, ſhould cheriſh their diſcontent, and, by their conduct at leaſt, encourage them in their prejudices againſt us, and afford them aſſiſtance

ance, till their numbers became much more conſiderable: And then avail themſelves of thoſe prejudices, to juſtify their numerous miſſions here, under a notion that there are *many* people among us, who cannot with a *good conſcience* worſhip God with us, and who are, for that reaſon, *grievouſly liable*, without epiſcopal miſſionaries, to become *atheiſts*, *infidels*, or *roman-catholicks*? It may poſſibly deſerve to be conſidered, (I ſay it with much reſpect and deference to that venerable body) whether it would not have well become the Society, when applications were firſt made to them for miſſionaries by people here, to hint to them, that their oppoſition to our way of worſhip might be too great; that they had better be content with it, till they ſhould be ſufficiently numerous and able to ſupport miniſters themſelves, more agreeable to their principles and inclinations; that many other people ſtood in much greater need of the Society's charitable care and aſſiſtance, being either ſtill in a ſtate of heatheniſm, or wholly deſtitute of the adminiſtration of God's word and ordinances in *any* proteſtant way; and that therefore it ought not to be taken unkindly, if their requeſts were not comply'd with. Had ſome ſuch method been taken at firſt, inſtead of countenancing a party ſpirit, the Society would have had much more money to expend in ſupporting the worſhip of God in places deſtitue of it, and chriſtianizing the Indians and Negroes; and there would probably have been but few perſons among us at this day, but what could with a *good conſcience* hold communion with us; in which they would be as effectually guarded againſt atheiſm, infidelity and popery, as in that of the church of England. But the Society have really contributed much towards ſtrengthening prejudices againſt us, and increaſing this party; till their prejudices are grown to ſuch an height, and their numbers are ſo conſiderable, that a neceſſity is now pleaded for continuing to give them large aſſiſtance, to prevent their becoming roman-catholics, infidels or atheiſts; becauſe, it is ſaid, their *conſciences* will not allow them to attend the adminiſtration of God's word and ſacraments in our churches. In which way of proceeding and reaſoning, the more miſſions are eſtabliſhed here, the greater will probably be the demand for them; ſince tis likely there will be ſome increaſe of *proſelytes* to the church, (to ſay nothing

of

of its increaſe *by natural, ordinary generation*) and therefore more ſuch tender *conſciences* to be conſidered: Till, in proceſs of time, the Society's whole fund may be too little to ſupply N. England only with miſſionaries; unleſs perhaps, by the epiſcopal party's becoming a majority in theſe colonies, the church of England ſhould alſo become the eſtabliſhed religion, and a common tax be impoſed by law for the ſupport of her clergy, ſo as to render any farther aſſiſtance from the Society unneceſſary. In which caſe, the unprovided colonies and the heathens may reap the whole advantage of its benefactions; of which they have hitherto been in ſo great a meaſure deprived, for the ſake of the epiſcopalians among us, at firſt but few, and thoſe not, in any juſt or proper ſenſe, deſtitute of the adminiſtration of God's word and ſacraments.

The gentleman ſometimes argues that the Society has formed no ſuch deſign as I have ſuppoſed, from this circumſtance, that they did not ſend miſſionaries *earlier* into N. England, when there were but *few church people* here, and conſequently *more need of miſſionaries* than afterwards, if making proſelytes had been the point in view*. This is more plauſible than ſolid. They may be ſuppoſed to have had the ſaid deſign before they ſent miſſionaries to proſecute it; waiting only for a favourable occaſion and opening. It would have been a romantic, *Don-Quixote* enterprize, for them to ſend miſſionaries hither for that purpoſe, before there were a number of people ready to receive and embrace them. They muſt have ſome footing, ſome ground *to ſtand on*, in order, by their *engines* aforeſaid, to ſhake this part of the earth; and they were not, I conclude, ſuch ſtrangers to the art and principles of *Archimides*, as to attempt it without. Nor does it appear, but that the Society embraced the *firſt* opportunity that offered, to eſtabliſh miſſions here. It is, I think, ſufficiently plain, that they had the deſign aforeſaid, as early as their *Account* was printed, 1706. But even tho' it could be proved, that they had it not for ſeveral years after the firſt miſſions, it will not follow that they have not formed it ſince; being encouraged by the increaſe of the epiſcopalian party here. And ſuch a deſign might very plauſibly be carried on, under the notion of *only*

* Vid. Pag. 29.

only providing for thoſe epiſcopalians, who could not with a *good conſcience* attend on the adminiſtration of God's word and ſacraments in our way. But enough of this.

From page 25 to 29 the gentleman ſpeaks of orthodoxy, heterodoxy and hereſy, in oppoſition to what I ſaid concerning the terms *orthodox miniſters*, in the charter; which I ſuppoſed, ſtand there in oppoſition to *Romiſh prieſts* and *jeſuits* only; but he, it ſeems, thinks *orthodox miniſters* can mean only thoſe of the church of England, in oppoſition to thoſe of all other denominations, even among proteſtants. It is only from this ſenſe of the terms, that he can deduce any conſequences to the advantage of his cauſe. But he has offer'd nothing in confirmation of it, which appears to me of any weight: I am therefore content to ſubmit this matter to the judgment of our impartial readers, without adding any thing farther upon it. But I cannot but take a brief notice of one or two perſonal reflections on myſelf, in this part of his performance. He has, without grounds, and very ungenerouſly, repreſented it as my opinion, *that whoever diſſents from me in* any point *relative to chriſtian faith, is an* HERETIC*. And what a candid uſe he would make of this remark, appears from his words immediately following: 'His N. England brethren, *if indeed* 'they will acknowledge him for a brother, are DESIRED to 'conſider the conſequences of this way of thinking. WE 'have not ſo learned Chriſt.' Now, I am very far from thinking all thoſe heretics or heterodox, who diſſent from me in *any point* relative to chriſtian faith. I have never given the leaſt occaſion for ſuch an aſperſion. There is, I believe, no profeſſed chriſtian, of any denomination, leſs diſpoſed to entertain hard thoughts of other people, merely on account of differences in opinion relative to points of faith, or who has been more remote from cenſuring and reproaching thoſe who think differently, as heterodox or heretical; neither of which opprobious epithets is, in my opinion, properly applied to any, but thoſe who *pertinaciouſly* deny ſome one or more of the moſt plain, indiſputable and important doctrines of the goſpel. It is thus, that I have *learned Chriſt*, and the ſpirit of his religion. And whereas the gentleman intimates, that they of the church of England are not

* Pag. 28.

not accuſtomed to cenſure as heretical, or raſhly to judge and condemn others; let the *Athanaſian* creed, and the *canons* of ſaid church (according to many of which, people are to be *ipſo facto* excommunicated for mere trifles) witneſs, how very unlucky he was in ſetting up thoſe of that communion, for patterns of chriſtian forbearance, or a catholick diſpoſition; unleſs to *catholic* we prefix another epithet, very often *joined* therewith. In this, and ſeveral other places, the gentleman inſinuates plainly enough, that I am an heretic myſelf, and ſo accounted by my *brethren*, if indeed they will at all *acknowledge* me for a brother. This piece of ſcandal was taken up, as I ſuppoſe, upon the credit of ſome of the profligate writers who have lately appeared againſt me in N. England: It is no honor to this gentleman to repeat it after them; nor would it be at all to his advantage if one were, from ſuch paſſages *only* as this, without conſidering the general tenor of his writing, to conjecture *how he himſelf has learned Chriſt*. And theſe reproachful innuendoes I take to be the leſs ingenuous, and more injurious, as coming from him, becauſe, if I have received *unfraternal* treatment from a *few* of my brethren, as indeed I have, this was chiefly becauſe I was ſuppoſed, whether truly or not, to approach too near, in ſome of my religious opinions, to thoſe of certain of the moſt eminent biſhops and other divines of the church of England, who were deſpitefully treated as heretics by many of *their* brethren; and whoſe names will be remembered with veneration, when thoſe of their [ſuppoſed] more orthodox revilers will either be forgotten thro' contempt, or remembered with execration, like thoſe of the *Lauds* and *Sacheverells* of former times. Theſe perſonal reflections of the gentleman, ſeem to me quite unworthy of *his* pen; eſpecially ſince I think them unworthy of a more particular reply from ſo mean a one as *mine*——The gentleman blames me, in the page laſt refered to, for intimating that our congregational miniſters generally adhere more cloſely to the doctrinal articles of the church of England, than even her own clergy do. 'We can only deny the charge', ſays he, 'and put him 'on the proof, as we do.' To which I ſhall only ſay at preſent, that I appeal for the truth of it, to the ſermons, &c. publiſhed by them reſpectively; not thinking it worth while,

while, by making large extracts from each, to ſwell this publication, in which I am at brevity.

In page 29 & 30 the gentleman ſpeaks of Dr. *Bray*'s teſtimony reſpecting N. England, and of ſome ſuppoſed miſrepreſentations of the miſſionaries here; endeavouring to invalidate what I ſaid upon theſe points. I am willing to leave our readers to judge, without adding any thing farther upon them. In anſwer to what I intimated about the Society's continuing to ſupport miſſions in N. England, in places where the epiſcopalians were able to maintain their own miniſters, the gentleman ſays: 'Now the Society 'hath always been deſirous to know, when any congrega-'tion became able to ſupport itſelf without their help - - - 'If their friends have been too ſlow in giving them intel-'ligence, which may have happened, and the Doctor will 'favour them with any, which on inquiry ſhall appear to 'be well grounded, they will both be thankful to him, 'and ſhew the world that they are far from wiſhing to in-'creaſe the church party by profuſe liberalities.'* This is very candidly ſaid, and I take the gentleman at his word, tho' without flattering myſelf, that I can ever merit the *thanks* of that venerable body, however ambitious I may be of it.——The people of the church of England in Newport on Rhode-Iſland, where the Society have long had a miſſionary, are numerous, and very wealthy. There are but few churches or congregations of any denomination in America, ſo able to maintain a miniſter as this. I give this account upon good authority; and particularly upon the credit of a gentleman of principal diſtinction, belonging to that congregation, who, ſince the publication of my *Obſervations* and former *Defence* of them, gave me this account in converſation. He alſo frankly owned, that he looked on the Society's continuing to ſupport a miniſter for them, [at Newport] as an evident miſapplication of their charity; and not the only one of the kind, in New-England. Without ſpeaking at preſent of any of the epiſcopal congregations in Connecticut, let me juſt obſerve, that the good people of *Chriſt's Church* in Boſton, tho' not ſo rich or numerous as thoſe of the church at Newport, are yet, without doubt, more able to ſupport a miniſter, than divers

* Pag. 30, 31.

divers of our congregational churches in this metropolis. And if ſupporting a miſſionary for them, be at all an abuſe, conſidering their own ability, and the exigence of other places, the abuſe is ſtill the greater, becauſe there are two other churches of England in the ſame town: Which churches are neither ſo remote, nor ſo thronged, but that the people of *Chriſt's church* might be accommodated in them; if not with ſuch *high pews* or *ſeats* as they might poſſibly chuſe, yet ſuch as, I ſhould think, humble and good chriſtians would rather take up with, than either violate their *conſciences* by going to *diſſenting meetings*, or receive the Society's charity, of which ſo many other people ſtand in far greater need. If the venerable Society ſhould condeſcend to pay any regard to theſe repreſentations, either ſome other perſon or myſelf, may probably be encouraged to mention other inſtances of abuſe, of a ſimilar nature. But this I can hardly hope, when I conſider what treatment the repreſentations of other *non-conformiſts* have met with in times paſt: This gives me leſs ground to expect *thanks*, than either ſilent neglect, or blame and reproof.

What follows, in ſeveral pages, relates to the piety and good morals of thoſe in general, who, from among us, become proſelytes to the church; to the reformation, or better ſtate of religion here, compared with what it formerly was; and to the extermination of a ſpirit of perſecution in the New-Englanders; all attributed by Mr. *Apthorp*, and by this gentleman after him, to the increaſe of the church of England here. The whole of which, to one who has a right underſtanding of things and facts here, muſt appear ſuch a *jeſt*, that he can hardly ſpeak *ſeriouſly* about it. And yet I will not now venture to ſpeak merrily or ludicrouſly of it, leſt I ſhould again diſpleaſe this good gentleman, who is already diſguſted with me in that reſpect; thinking it a proof that I have not a duly *ſerious heart*. For it is upon this occaſion, that he ſays: 'What 'the Doctor's *countenance* is, I know not' [none of the moſt *jocular*, I can aſſure him] 'but I wiſh he gave as good 'proofs of a *ſerious heart*, as the miſſionaries generally do.'‡

‡ P. 33.

And can it be wonder'd at, if thoſe reverend gentlemen, who received the *Holy Ghoſt* at their ordination, by means of the the hands or breath of a biſhop, ſhould have more *ſerious hearts* than a perſon, who has had only what thorough-pac'd churchmen account lay-ordination, in one of thoſe *unconſecrated* places, in which ſome zealous epiſcopal divines have ſuppoſed, the *Holy Spirit never was.* ‡ And yet I cannot think with this gentleman, that ſpeaking jocoſely about ſome ſacerdotal ſuperſtitions, rites and forms, is a proof that a man hath not a *ſerious heart.* But ſome men conclude all thoſe profane and impious, who have not the ſame reverence for ſuch things, that they have themſelves, or that they would have the common people entertain, for the honour of an eſtabliſhment and the hierarchy.

In ſpeaking about a *toleration*, and the growing eſteem of it, the gentleman ſays, *he hopes the generality of the miſſionaries carried that eſteem with them into N. England.** If ſo, I wiſh they had generally by their meekneſs and charity towards non-conformiſts, given *better proofs* of it than they have. He adds: 'Their *need of toleration* 'muſt recommend it ſtill more to their good opinion,' &c. Neither the clergy nor laity of the church of England here, will, I believe, thank him for arguing their eſteem of toleration, from this circumſtance; it being a plain conceſſion, that the ſaid church is not the *eſtabliſhed* religion of New-England. For certainly thoſe of the eſtabliſhed religion in any country, cannot properly be ſaid to *need toleration* therein. And many, if not moſt of our epiſcopalians, triumph exceedingly in a preſumption, that their church, excluſive of all others, is eſtabliſhed here; and conſequently that, not they, but we, *need toleration.* The virulent *Examiner* of my *Obſervations* harped long upon this ſtring, and was very confident: And it is, I ſuppoſe, in a great meaſure on the ſame preſumption, that the eſpiſcopalians here, eſpecially the clergy, have been ſo haughty, diſdainful and over-bearing in their carriage towards

‡ This was ſaid by a great and zealous churchman, of the diſſenting *Meeting-Houſes.*

* P. 35.

wards us; giving themſelves airs of ſuperiority, as if we did not by any means ſtand on equal ground with them. 'Tho' I do not intend this as a general charge, there being perſons among them of a very different temper and behaviour; and who are accordingly to be much reſpected.

The gentleman comes, p. 37, to ſpeak of the ſuppoſed neglect of the *heathen*; which he thinks a groundleſs imputation. And here he taxes me with miſapplying biſhop *Williams*'s words, in his ſermon before the Society. 'Unhappily for the Doctor, ſays, he, biſhop *Williams* doth 'not ſpeak of the Society, in the words which he quotes, 'but of the Engliſh nation.------ But the biſhop's words 'ſounded ſo *plauſibly* for a charge upon the Society, that 'he *could not forbear miſapplying them.*' † Now, if the gentleman will be pleaſed to review the paſſage in the *Obſervations* (p. 98) he may find himſelf under a miſtake. I did not ſay, that the Society had in ſome ſort allowed the complaint againſt *themſelves* to be juſt, as he ſuppoſes; nor quote biſhop *Williams* to prove this, but that the natives had *actually* been neglected. However, I acknowledge I did, both juſt before and after, ſpeak of the Society's neglecting them; ſo that I can eaſily account for the gentleman's thinking, I cited biſhop *Williams* to prove this; and therefore do not accuſe him of wilfully injuring me in this reſpect. After citing biſhop *Williams*, I added; 'It is unneceſſary to confirm and juſtify this complaint, 'by an appeal to *any* of the later ſermons before the 'Society; which would be no difficult matter.' Upon which words the gentleman hath put a wrong conſtruction, by ſaying that I affirm, *it would not be difficult to juſtify this complaint by an appeal to* any *of the later ſermons;* as if my ſenſe was, that *all* the later ſermons might be cited in juſtification of it. This is the import of the word *any*, as uſed by him; whereas it means only *ſome*, as uſed by me in the clauſe aforeſaid; as any one who underſtands the Engliſh idiom, may eaſily perceive. So that the gentleman has here fallen into a double error in repreſenting my ſenſe; which, however, I do not impute to any ill deſign.

† P. 37.

But he has perverted my words and meaning in the ſame page, in a way that I cannot ſo eaſily apologize for: I mean, by ſaying, that *in one place I expreſs a doubt whether the Society have* 'ſo much as begun to uſe methods of 'converting either the Negroes or the Indians.' Now, in the place alluded to in the *Obſervations* (p. 135) what I expreſſed a doubt concerning, was not, whether the Society had begun to uſe *any* methods to this end, as his words plainly imply; but whether they had begun 'to 'ſtudy, and to *uſe diligently* the moſt probable methods 'of converting,' &c. In which ſentence the chief emphaſis is put upon the words *uſe diligently;* which were accordingly before printed in *italics;* but which he has intirely omitted in his repreſentation of my ſenſe: Whether for any better reaſon, than that he might make me appear to charge the Society with more negligence than I did, or thought of, he himſelf can beſt tell.

The gentleman goes on, from page 37 to 49, to ſpeak of the endeavours uſed by the Society to chriſtianize the Indians and Negroes; of the difficulties and diſcouragements attending this good work; and of the ſuppoſed injuſtice done the Society by me, in accuſing them of any negligence in this reſpect. He has ſaid many things very judiciouſly and ſolidly upon this head. And I frankly own, that, taking for truth what he has produced from Dr. *Humphreys*'s *Hiſtory* (which I *never ſaw*) relative to what the Society have done for the Indians, I uſed ſeveral expreſſions, much too diminutive of the pains taken by them in this department. I am ſorry I uſed any expreſſions, whether for want of better information, or through haſte in writing, which tended to lead my readers to think the Society had taken leſs pains than they actually have, towards the converſion of the Indians. Their endeavours to this end have been very conſiderable, according to the aforeſaid *Hiſtory*, as cited by this gentleman. But ſtill I muſt beg leave to think that, all things conſidered, much leſs has been done in this matter, than might have been reaſonably expected; and that much more probably would have been done, to the ſpiritual good of the natives, and

the

the great benefit of the Britiſh colonies, had not the Society been ſo deeply engaged, and ſpent ſo much of their revenue, in ſupporting and increaſing the epiſcopal party, as ſuch, in New-England. What the gentleman has offered as to Mr. (now Dr.) *Barclay*'s miſſion to the Iroquois, his ſmall encouragement from the Society, and being refuſed a ſchool-maſter and interpreter to aſſiſt him, appears to me unſatisfactory. I will not, however, ſpend time in controverting that matter; but am willing all ſhould form a judgment, by comparing the extracts from Mr. *Barclay*'s own letters in the *Obſervations*, with what this gentleman has offered upon the point.

He proceeds, page 49, 50 and 51, to ſpeak of what the Society has done for the ſupport of God's public worſhip in the *unprovided* colonies. I ſhall not go into a particular conſideration of what he has offered upon this head; partly, to avoid prolixity, and partly becauſe it is ſufficient for my purpoſe, if thoſe colonies and the natives have actually had ſo much the leſs care taken of, and the leſs money employed for their benefit, in proportion to what has been taken of, and expended for, the New-England Epiſcopalians; which is undeniable, ſince this money could not be employed in both theſe ways at once. Let me, however, juſt obſerve, that I can prove by a ſubſtantial living witneſs, that I received the account given by me of the repeated ineffectual applications of the *North Carolinians* to the Society for miſſionaries, from a gentleman of principal diſtinction of that country; tho' I did not recollect, when I wrote the *Obſervations*, that I could bring any perſon to atteſt to the truth of it, and ſpoke with a degree of caution, being unwilling to truſt my own memory too far; at which this grave gentleman is pleaſed to make himſelf a little merry. If I am publicly called on, by any perſon who has a right to farther information, I will, for my own juſtification, mention the *name* both of my informer, and the witneſs to whom I refer; tho' I flatter myſelf, that with thoſe who know me, this will be needleſs.

The

The gentleman objects, page 52. againſt what I ſaid of the *ſum* expended by the Society in New-England; and ſays, I *ſhew the ſame inclination to exaggerate in this, as in every thing*. Now he knew, becauſe I expreſly ſaid, I did 'not pretend to be very exact as to the *quantum*.' But yet he has offered nothing, to ſhew I was under any miſtake in this reſpect; and I am perſuaded that I rather kept much within bounds, than exceeded them. But I own that I was much out, in ſaying that 40 or 50 miſſions might have been comfortably maintained among the Indians, and in heatheniſh places, with 35,000 £. ſterling, for more than 30 years paſt. I know not how to account for this error; but ſure I am, that I was deceived myſelf, and had no deſign to deceive others; as may well be ſuppoſed, from the very nature of the error. I willingly ſtand corrected as to this. But let it be obſerved, that this is a miſtake, which does not affect the main argument. For tho' but half, or much leſs than half ſo many miſſions could have been ſupported with the ſum aforeſaid, as I then ſuppoſed; ſtill a conſiderable number might, and, as I humbly conceive, ought to have been, for the benefit of the Indians, &c. The queſtion is not, *how much* money has been miſapplied, or *how many* miſſions might have been ſupported therewith, where they were moſt needed; but whether any conſiderable ſum has been, and whether that might not have been employed in ways plainly conformable to the charter. Unleſs theſe things are diſproved, it is of little conſequence to ſhew, that I was miſtaken as to the other points.

The gentleman proceeds to object againſt what was ſaid reſpecting the Engliſh diſſenters being induced to aſſiſt the Society, upon a preſumption that their fund was employed, not for the ſupport and increaſe of the epiſcopal party, as ſuch, but for the common cauſe of proteſtant chriſtianity. He ſays, it cannot be ſuppoſed that they were ignorant what the Society was doing in New-England; that the preſent Archbiſhop of Canterbury mentioned the caſe of the Epiſcopalians here, very explicitly, above 20 years ago, in his ſermon; and that it was taken notice

notice of in other of the anniverſary ſermons, and in the *abſtracts*. This, he ſays, is very remote from *fraudulent dealing*; and that the diſſenters muſt be preſumed to have done whatever they did to aſſiſt the Society, *with their eyes open.*† But from accounts which I have received from England, and from perſons *whoſe characters I am acquainted with*, I have good reaſon to think, not only that many diſſenters, but even many epiſcopalians there, have contributed their help to the Society, without any diſtinct knowledge of the ways, in which the money was employed; particularly, without ſuſpecting that any of it was expended in the manner that ſo much has been, in theſe parts, where the ſupport of God's public worſhip was ſo well provided for. And if the gentleman is right in his ſuppoſition, 'that the diſſenters, at leaſt for many years 'paſt, have contributed little or nothing;'‡ to me this is an evidence, that their *eyes are*, of late years, *more opened* than they were before; and that their with-holding their charity, is owing to their both *ſeeing* and *diſliking* the uſe that was made of it, in building up the church of England here, in oppoſition to churches of their own denomination. This is rendered the more probable, by what the gentleman adds a little after, ſuppoſing him not to be miſtaken in point of fact, viz. that 'ſome, if not many of them, have taken '*great pains* to diſſuade members of the church of Eng-'land from giving on ſuch occaſions.' If any of them have really done ſo, the moſt natural account and ſolution that can be given of it, is, that this money was, in great part, now found to be miſapplied, in ſupporting and ſtrengthening the cauſe of epiſcopacy, to the neglect of the heathen, &c. and to the prejudice of their brethren in New-England. Surely, it cannot be ſuppoſed that the diſſenters would have had any objection againſt the Society's being aſſiſted in propagating the goſpel among the Indians and Negroes, or in ſupporting the public worſhip of God in places deſtitute of it. There is no reaſon to doubt, but that they would have readily contributed themſelves to theſe pious deſigns, inſtead of diſſwading epiſcopalians

† P 53, 54. ‡ Ibid.

palians from doing ſo. We are well informed, indeed, that the epiſcopalians, not to ſay the Society, lately made great oppoſition to our having a charter *merely* for propagating the goſpel among the Indians, at our own expence; but I do not believe that the Engliſh diſſenters have ſhewn the ſame ſpirit againſt the eſtabliſhed church, or the Society; tho' the gentleman ſays, with a degree of acrimony, that 'on the whole, the Society would certainly come off very 'well in reſpect of the diſſenters, *if they would neither do* '*it good nor harm.* †

He ſays farther, in vindication of theſe miſſions, that '*probably* much more money hath been given to the 'Society by the members of the church of England, on 'account of the proviſion which it hath made for the 'epiſcopalians in the Maſſachuſetts and Connecticut, than 'they would have given if it had made none:' That therefore 'other parts have not ſuffered on their account;' and that, 'ſhould theſe benefactors be brought to think 'the Society an *improper channel* for ſuch their bounty, 'or ſhould it be *forbidden* to employ in this manner any 'ſhare of what it receives, the conſequence *might be*, that 'they would withdraw a proportion of their preſent 'liberality----and eſtabliſh a ſeparate fund,' &c. ‡ Let it be obſerved, that however plauſible this reaſoning may appear, it is grounded on mere ſuppoſitions and conjectures. The gentleman thinks theſe things *probable*, and that they *might* take place: Others may think them improbable, and perhaps with greater reaſon. But even ſuppoſing them certain, tho' they may be pleaded by way of apology, they cannot be pleaded as a full juſtification of the Society, unleſs it is authorized by its charter, to employ a part of its fund in this way; which is the main point in diſpute. And this the gentleman does in effect acknowledge, by ſaying; 'If indeed the caſe of the epiſcopalians in the 'Maſſachuſetts and Connecticut doth not, by the charter 'of the Society, come under its care, bounties to them are 'at preſent conveyed thro' wrong hands;'* That is, in plain

† p. 54. ‡ Vid. p. 54, 55, 56. * ibid.

plain Engliſh, then the Society apply a great part of their fund improperly, and without authority for ſo doing, or miſapply it. So that he allows the conſequence to be juſt; let others judge of the premiſes.

In the next place, the gentleman expreſſeth his diſlike at my ſuppoſing, ſome would juſtify theſe miſſions under a pretext, that rectifying the ſtate of religion among us, or, in other words, ſupporting and propagating the church of England in *theſe colonies*, is one neceſſary means of converting the Indians. He ſays, he queſtions whether the defenders of the Society have ever applied this *to the New-England presbyterians or congregationaliſts*; that *the biſhop of St.* David's, *whom alone I quoted, intimates no ſuch thing*; and that I *muſt be underſtood to put this plea into their mouths, only as an opportunity of introducing my wit, and abuſing the miſſionaries* *. Now, let it be obſerved, that if ſuch a plea has actually been uſed, this gentleman owns it to be a weak one. But Mr. *Apthorp* cited the biſhop of *St. David*'s ſermon, apparently with this view; I mean in part. And tho' New-England is not particularly mentioned; yet, I think, the expreſſions quoted by Mr. *Apthorp*, will fairly admit of this conſtruction. I therefore took them in the ſenſe which, I ſuppoſed, that gentleman did. Speaking of the Society's care to *remedy the ill ſtate of religion in our colonies*, his Lordſhip ſays, 'without this care, the converſion of the neighbouring Savages can hardly be effected'. Mr. *Apthorp* applied this, as his argument required, to thoſe colonies, againſt the epiſcopal miſſions in which, objections had been made; and theſe, all know, are principally the New-England colonies. With the ſame view he cited biſhop *Berkley*'s ſermon, in which it is ſaid, 'It ſhould ſeem the likelieſt ſtep towards converting the heathens, would be to begin with the Engliſh', &c. And part of his citation from the preſent Archbiſhop of Canterbury's ſermon before the Society, has ſo much the appearance of being to his purpoſe in this reſpect, that I cannot think it very ſtrange if he conceived this to be the real ſcope of it, tho' it might not be ſo. For, after ſpeaking of the epiſcopal miſſions in places *where there were already chriſtian ſocie-*

* Vid. p. 56 57.

ties eſtabliſhed and ſupported; which, as he intimates, had proved happily *inſtrumental to bring people over to the church,* his Grace ſubjoins; 'Indeed, *unity of profeſſion* 'amongſt ourſelves - - - will greatly recommend our reli-'gion to the infidels; who elſe may be tempted to con-'tinue as they are, for want of knowing *with whom to* '*join*'. All theſe are Mr. *Apthorp*'s authorities, produced by him to juſtify thoſe epiſcopal miſſions, which are objected againſt; and theſe, as was before obſerved, are the New-England ones. And when the tenor of theſe paſſages is conſidered, together with his more manifeſt deſign in introducing them, am not I improperly accuſed of putting a ridiculous plea into the mouths of the Society's defenders, for the pleaſure of laughing at, and expoſing it? But what if the Society have expreſſed themſelves, in their own printed *Account,* in ſuch a manner, that it may be well ſuppoſed, they judge it a good one? I think they have actually done ſo, in the paſſage cited by me, page 18 & 19 of theſe *Remarks.* For after ſpeaking explicitly of the *independent congregations in New-England,* as well as of *other ways of diviſion and ſeparation in other colonies,* and the need of providing for a *regular and orthodox miniſtry among them;* they expreſs the propoſed end thereof, in theſe words, viz. 'to remove thoſe *prejudices,* under which 'the people generally laboured, and to promote, *as much* '*as poſſible,* an agreement in faith & worſhip, *in order to* '*the recommending our holy religion to unbelievers.*' Now, if this is a weak plea, as the gentleman ſeems to allow, I leave him to ſhew *his own wit,* either in making the beſt of it, or in excuſing himſelf for inſulting me, as if I had invented, and *put it into the mouths* of the Society's defenders, as an opportunity to introduce *mine,* in expoſing it to ridicule.

'This reſpectable gentleman having ſaid thus much, by way of *Anſwer to me,* proceeds very candidly and obligingly, page 57, *to anſwer himſelf;* at leaſt, to make ſuch conceſſions, and to apologize for the Society in ſuch a way, as in a great meaſure to juſtify the complaints againſt its conduct. He ſays; 'In all that I have hitherto ſaid, I 'am *far* from intending to affirm, that the Society hath 'not laid out in the Maſſachuſetts and Connecticut *too large*

'a

'a proportion of the money put into their hands, 'consi-'dering *the neceſſities of other provinces*'. It ſeems then, that the controverſy between him and me, is no longer, whether there has been *juſt cauſe* of complaint given, with reference to theſe miſſions; but whether there has been *ſo much* as I have ſuppoſed. Again; ſpeaking of the Society's having a diſcretionary power *within the bounds of their truſt*, which I never denied, (tho' I denied a power to *make alterations in their inſtitution*) he ſays: 'But ſtill 'they ought to uſe their power *judiciouſly*, and in that 'they *may have* failed †'. And the gentleman well knows, I did not impute to them any *known*, *wilful* abuſe of their power, or miſapplication of monies; but ſtudiouſly guarded againſt ſuch a conſtruction of my words: So that he has here acknowledged, in ſubſtance, the main point which I laboured to prove. He adds, juſt after, with a ſarcaſtic air; 'Even the Doctor's two *blameleſs Societies* might 'poſſibly exhibit ſome tincture of human frailty, if they 'did not *warily* keep their tranſactions *unpubliſhed*, whilſt 'thoſe of ours *lie open to the world*.' The Societies to which he alludes, can never need any defence of mine; eſpecially, not before he accuſes them of any thing, and only inſinuates that there *might* be grounds for it, if their tranſactions were made public. But ſince he ſpeaks of theſe, as *warily* kept in the dark, while thoſe of the epiſcopal Society *lie open to the world*; I cannot but obſerve, that tho' *Abſtracts* of their proceedings are annually *printed* with the ſermons, it is no eaſy thing for us non conformiſts to get a ſight of them. It has been taken notice of by others, as well as myſelf, that the epiſcopalians here are often very ſhy and reſerved as to lending them; as if they apprehended, there were ſome things in them, which ſhould not be *too narrowly* looked into; perhaps the miſſionaries letters; I know not. But it was partly for this reaſon, that in the year 1759, I applied to a Book-ſeller in Boſton, to ſend for 25 of the anniverſary ſermons and abſtracts for me. He accordingly wrote for them to his correſpondent, a very noted Book-ſeller in London, whoſe anſwer is now in my hands, with his name ſubſcribed. In this he ſays, that *the annual ſermons are things which are*

† P. 57.

not to be bought; that *had they been ſo, money would have purchaſed them*; 'but as they are' (ſo he expreſſes himſelf) 'it is *ſolicitations* that muſt do it'. He adds, that *he applied to Dr.* Barecroft, *the Society's ſecretary, for the ſermons*, who told him, he had not the *five firſt* ſent for; *and as for the twenty laſt, unleſs he knew* 'the perſon' they were for, he could not part with them; for as the 'Society printed them to diſtribute, and not to ſell, they 'had ordered him to do *ſo as to be of ſervice to the* 'Society'. If need be, I will hereafter mention both the London and the Boſton Book-ſeller by *name*. And from the foregoing little anecdote it may be inferred, that tho' *ſome* of the Society's tranſactions are annually printed, yet they do not lie altogether ſo *open to the view of the world*, that the gentleman had any reaſon to boaſt thereof, in compariſon with the *wary* conduct of the other Societies. And one who deals in ſuſpicions and innuendoes like his, might hint, that if *all* of them did ſo, this epiſcopal Society might *poſſibly exhibit ſome tinctures of human frailty*, even *beyond* what he has ſo candidly acknowledged. But I cannot think inſinuations of this nature, juſtifiable, by whomſoever uſed.

The gentlemen goes on to *excuſe* the Society's ſending ſo many more miſſionaries to New-England than was proper, even in his own opinion. He intimates that the epiſcopalians here, have been more *preſſing ſolicitors* than thoſe in other plantations: That when the earlier applications were made, it could not be *foreſeen whether more would follow*; ſo that the *miſſions became inſenſibly numerous*; and that *when many requeſts had been granted, it was the harder to refuſe others, for which the ſame plea could be made* *. It is owned that theſe things have weight, conſidered as an apology for what does not, ſtrictly ſpeaking, admit of a juſtification. It is apparently with the former view, not the latter, that they are here introduced; and, conſidered in that light, I hope no man ſhall be found more ready than myſelf, to acknowledge their pertinence, or to allow them their due force. The gentleman immediately adds another circumſtance of moment, conſidered in the ſame view. 'Some members of the 'Society

* P. 58.

'Society approved this increaſe [of miſſions;] others 'thought it was going *too far*. And in all bodies of men, 'whoſe opinion differ, there muſt be mutual condeſcenſi-'ons, and time allowed for one ſide to come over into 'the ſentiments of the other, elſe they cannot proceed 'together.' This is ſtill apologizing, not juſtifying. And hence it appears that, not only many people out of the Society, but a conſiderable number of its own members, have long thought its proceedings amiſs in this reſpect. The gentleman ought therefore, methinks, to judge candidly of the former; eſpecially ſince it ſeems, by what he ſays, that thoſe members of the Society, who ſo nearly agree with us in the main point, have at length convinced the others, induced them to *come over into their ſentiments*, and thereby ratified the judgment of all, who tho't thoſe proceedings unjuſtifiable. This is but a natural conſtruction of the gentleman's words; who adds, a little after: 'And now, for 'ſome time paſt, the Society have *excuſed* themſelves from 'complying with *any application from that quarter*.' This, being compared with what was ſaid juſt before, about *difference* of opinion in the Society, and the need of *condeſcenſions*, and *time for one ſide to come over into the ſentiments of the other*, is ſaying in effect, that the Society are now generally convinced, that thoſe of their members, who were againſt multiplying miſſions here, were in the right; and that, in conſequence hereof, they have *excuſed* themſelves from ſending miſſionaries into theſe parts. I cannot but be very glad of theſe important hints. They at once juſtify myſelf and others, who have objected againſt theſe miſſions, at leaſt in ſome meaſure; and alſo afford grounds to hope, that this charitable fund will, for the future, be employed in ways more agreeable to its original deſign, more beneficial to the world, and therefore more honourable to the Society. The gentleman adds: 'Surely this alone is no 'inconſiderable argument, that proſelyting thoſe two diſ-'tricts to epiſcopacy, hath not been the point in view'. I confeſs, that if the Society ſhould diſcontinue their miſſions here, it would be a good argument that they are *no longer* proſecuting that ſcheme; but, how it would prove that they *never* had any ſuch deſign, is as much beyond my poor capacity, as to reconcile this ſuppoſition with their paſt conduct, or with their own *Account*. There

There is ſo much good ſenſe and candor in the gentleman's next paragraph; ſuch a plain conceſſion that the Society's conduct has been unjuſtifiable, and ſuch clear intimations that an alteration of meaſures is intended; that, notwithſtanding ſome blame is laid upon me in it, I cannot forbear citing it at large, as follows:

'*What is paſt*, as the Doctor obſerves, *cannot be recalled.* 'But if Miſtakes have happened, they may be avoided for 'the future, and the Society *is not above altering its Mea-* 'ſures. Doubtleſs it would have liked, and might have 'expected, civiler and fairer Treatment, than he hath vouch- 'ſafed to give it. But however, *fas eſt & ab hoſte doceri.* 'It cannot deſert and abandon the Congregations which it 'hath taken under its Protection, unleſs they ſhould become 'either too rich to need its Aſſiſtance, or too inconſiderable 'to deſerve it. But more Care may be uſed to know, when 'either of theſe Things falls out. All Forwardneſs in Miſſi- 'onaries to moleſt Perſons of other Perſuaſions, and all En- 'couragement of Parties and Factions in order to ſerve Ec- 'cleſiaſtical Schemes, may be ſtrictly prohibited, and on 'reaſonable Complaint ſeverely checked. The eyes of the 'Society may be turned more attentively to the dark Cor- 'ners of the Colonies, to the Methods which promiſe well 'for the more effectual Inſtruction of the *Negroes*, and to 'the openings for doing good amongſt the *Indians*, which 'his Majeſty's new Acquiſitions will probably diſcloſe. A 'friendly Correſpondence may alſo be carried on between 'ſome of the Members of that Body, and ſome of the '*Presbyterian* or Congregational Miniſters, whoſe Diſpoſi- 'tions are mild and ingenuous; and thus Animoſities and 'Jealouſies may by Degrees be extinguiſhed, of which, I 'am perſuaded, the Society is very deſirous.'*

One can hardly too much praiſe the candor, and chriſtian temper, appearing in the foregoing paſſage. I am very ſorry, however, that the gentleman ſhould ſpeak of me as an *enemy* to the Society, for endeavouring to ſet ſome of their conduct in a true point of light. And he had the leſs reaſon for this, becauſe he has plainly conceded *in general*, that my objections were not without foundation. I ſay, *in general*; for I cannot pretend to the honor of having him, who

* Pag. 58, 59.

who appeared ſo oppoſite to me in the former part of his Anſwer, *intirely* of my opinion before he got to the end of it. Thus far, I think, we are agreed, *viz.* That conſidering the neceſſities of the Indians, Negroes, and ſome of the colonies, the Society have expended too great a proportion of their revenne on the New England miſſions; and conſequently, that an alteration of meaſures in this reſpect, was much to be deſired. The chief remaining differences, I take to be theſe, *viz.* He thinks one *principle* on which my argument proceeds, is falſe; *namely* this, That a few epiſcopalians living among congregationaliſts, where the adminiſtration of God's word and ſacraments is duly provided for *in their way*, cannot properly be ſaid, in the *general* terms of the charter, to *want the adminiſtration of God's word and ſacraments*, merely becauſe they have it not after the *particular* mode of the church of England. He thinks they may. Another diſagreement is the neceſſary reſult of this; *viz.* That I ſuppoſe *all* the money expended by the Society, in the aſſiſtance of epiſcopalians here, who are in thoſe circumſtances, miſapplied: Whereas he ſuppoſes, that *part* of it is applied rightly, tho' not *ſo much*; and tho' he acknowledges that *their caſe is not particularly deſcribed and provided for in the charter.* †

If the aforeſaid *principle* is right, my concluſion from it cannot be wrong; both are ſubmitted to the judgment of the intelligent and impartial. But let it be remembered, that tho' I lay great ſtreſs upon this principle; yet I never have reſted, nor do now reſt the controverſy, *wholly* upon the truth of it. In the *Obſervations* I repeatedly put in a caveat to this purpoſe. And agreeably hereto, this gentleman, tho' he diſallows the ſaid principle, which I think ſo juſt a one, yet is *far from affirming that the Society hath not laid out*, in theſe parts, *too large a proportion of their money*; and ſays, that *miſtakes may be avoided for the future.* If the grounds of complaint are removed, as he intimates they are likely to be, all ought to be conten; tho' this ſhould not be done for the ſame *formal reaſon*, that ſome ſuppoſe it ought to be. I am confirmed in my general opinion, that the Society's conduct has been juſtly exceptionable, not only by what this gentleman grants, whoſe judgment has great weight

† Pag. 23.

weight with me; but by the credible intelligence which I have had, concerning the ſentiments of his Grace the Archbiſhop of Canterbury, expreſſed at a meeting of the Society the laſt ſummer; which, as I am informed, were exactly agreeable to this gentleman's, in the *conceſſionary* part of his performance. And it may be worth conſidering, whether theſe do not come ſo near to mine at laſt, that in caſe of a *third* edition of this Tract, ſome more proper title may not be found for it, than that of *An Anſwer* to me; tho' I cannot agree with ſome who have hinted, that it might nearly as well be intitled, *An Anſwer to Thomas à Kempis*, or to *Don Quixote*.

The gentleman proceeds, page 59 and onwards, to ſpeak largely of the propoſal for American biſhops; of which he is a warm favourer. This is a matter which I did not undertake to diſcuſs, and only touched upon, *en paſſant*. And yet the gentleman is at once ſo deſirous to have me for his opponent herein, and ſo very obliging, that he has undertaken to *propoſe my objections diſtinctly for me*; becauſe, he ſays, *I was a great deal too vehement to do it myſelf*.* How can I refuſe, after ſuch a piece of courteſy, and ſo great an obligation laid upon me, to ſay ſomething farther upon this point? But inſtead of particularly conſidering what he has ſaid in anſwer to thoſe objections, which, as he intimates, he ſo kindly put into proper order for me, (ſome of which, by the way, *I did not ſo much as think of* when I mentioned this affair of American biſhops, I will briefly ſtate his ſcheme relative to biſhops here, and make a few remarks upon it. And if I ſhould be *too vehement*, or have my ideas too confuſed, to make theſe remarks *diſtinctly* enough, I may well be thought very happy, in having an opponent of ſo cool and clear a head, and ſo benevolent a heart, as to ſupply that defect for me, without taking any ungenerous advantage of it, or upbraiding me with the *favor* afterwards.

The gentleman briefly mentions the good ends propoſed, in having biſhops in America. Theſe are in ſubſtance the ſame with thoſe which are *more diſtinctly* mentioned in the *Abſtract*, printed 1715, and which are chiefly theſe; *viz.* (1.) 'To *rule* and *govern* well thoſe people who are de-
'ſirous to be committed to their charge.'— (2.) To *defend* and

* Pag. 60, 61.

' and *protect* both the clergy and the laity'---(3.) ' To *unite* ' the clergy themſelves, and *reduce them to order*'---' And ' laſtly, to *confirm* new converts from *ſchiſm*; "--- That the " laity who have been initiated into the chriſtian faith by " baptiſm, may not only have the *benefit of confirmation*; " but alſo in conjunction with the reſt of the members of " the church in thoſe remote parts, be partakers of the *be-* " *nign influences* of the epiſcopal function;" ' in *ordaining* ' miniſters from amongſt themſelves; in *confirming weak* ' *brethren*, and *bleſſing* all manner of people *ſuſceptible of* ' *ſuch holy impreſſions*, as are made by the *impoſition of the* ' *biſhop's hands*.'† As theſe are the reaſons for biſhops here, which the Society has publiſhed, it may be concluded this gentleman approves them all, tho' he has not ſo particularly mentioned them. It might be thought foreign, perhaps preſumptuous, diſtinctly to examine the force of them; how much the epiſcopalians here, *need* to be *well ruled* and *governed*; how much both the clergy and laity need *defence* and *protection* againſt non-conformiſts; how much the clergy need to be *united*, and reduced to *order*. I was going to ſay ſomething about the *confirmation* of *new converts from ſchiſm*, and of other *weak brethren* and *ſiſters*; the neceſſity of having epiſcopal *ordination* here; the *benign influences* of epiſcopacy in general; and of the *bleſſings* which *all manner of people, ſuſceptible of ſuch holy impreſſions*, might receive by the *impoſition* of *the biſhop's hands*. But I forbear; and the rather, becauſe I might problably expreſs myſelf in ſuch a manner, as to confirm this gentleman's ſuſpicion about the *ſerioufneſs of my heart*. For I am ſo conſcious of my own infirmity, as to be almoſt certain that I could not ſpeak of theſe things with quite ſo much *gravity* and *ſolemnity*, as he would think proper, in treating of matters ſo *ſublime, myſterious* and *ſacred*. They are therefore paſſed over with a bare mention.

The gentleman, I muſt own, has, in his ſcheme, ſet this propoſal for American biſhops in a more plauſible, and leſs exceptionable point of view, than I have ſeen it placed in before. For,

† *Abſtract* 1715, p. 53, 54.

Firſt, he propoſes that they ſhould 'have no concern 'in the leaſt with any *perſons* who do not profeſs themſelves to be *of the church of England*.'‡

Secondly, he ſays, 'it is not deſired in the leaſt that 'that they ſhould hold courts to try matrimonial or teſtamentary cauſes, or be veſted with any authority, now 'exercited either by provincial governors or ſubordinate 'magiſtrates, or infringe or diminiſh any *privileges* and '*liberties* enjoyed by any of the laity,' &c.‖ But that they ſhould be intirely confined to ſuch *religious* and *ſacred offices as the aforeſaid*.

Thirdly, as to the place or places of the epiſcopal reſidence; he believes no *ſingle perſon hath once named or thought of* New-England, as a proper *place for the reſidence of a biſhop*; 'but *epiſcopal colonies* have been always propoſed.'* And he thinks that ſuch perſons ſhould be ſent in this character, 'as are leaſt likely to cauſe *uneaſineſs*.'§

This, he aſſures us, 'is the real and only ſcheme that 'hath been planned for biſhops in America; and whoever hath heard of any other, hath been miſinformed 'through miſtake or deſign.'†

To ſpeak for my ſelf, then, I am one of thoſe who have been thus *miſinformed*; and I know of others who have been ſo, in common with me. I did not ſuppoſe, the *true* ſcheme was, that American biſhops ſhould have *no* concern, but with *epiſcopalians*; or that they ſhould be wholly confined to the *ſacred* offices aforeſaid. As to the *place* of the epiſcopal reſidence; I thought it not improbable, that if ſeveral biſhops were ſent, one of them would be ſtationed in *New-England*, to confirm and ordain; and to *bleſs all manner of people* here, *ſuſceptible*, &c. Let me add; ſince a miſſion was eſtabliſhed at Cambridge, and a very ſumptuous dwelling-houſe (for this country) erected there, that town hath been often talked of by epiſcopalians as well as others, as the propoſed place of reſidence for a biſhop; which I thought not improbable. And I have reaſon to take it amiſs that this gentleman, ſpeaking of what I hinted about Mr. *Apthorp*, and a *ſuperb edifice in a neighbouring town*, has

‡ P. 60. ‖ Ibid. * P. 66. § P. 67. † P. 60.

has impeached my integrity; ſuggeſting that I did not entertain any ſuch apprehenſion, as I expreſſed. He ſays, with a ſarcaſtic air, on this occaſion, 'So much *wit* and *archneſs*, how greatly ſoever the Doctor abounds in it, would have been too great a ſacrifice to make to *dull truth* and *fact*.'† He may be pleaſed to know, that he caſts this aſperſion on a man, who, unleſs he is quite a ſtranger to himſelf, would not ſacrifice what he calls *dull truth* and *fact*, for any worldly conſideration, not even to be an *Archbiſhop*; much leſs for the airy reputation of *archneſs*. Nor is this the only time by ſeveral, that he has accuſed me of being *witty*; a charge, but very little, if at all, deſerved by me. However, I will not *retort* the accuſation; tho' it is my real opinion, that if this gentleman never degenerates from good ſenſe into right down wit himſelf, he ſometimes makes alarming approaches towards it, and ſhews at leaſt a ſtrong *inclination* thereto; in which, I ſuppoſe, the eſcence of the *ſin*, if it be one, chiefly conſiſts.

But to return: I pretend not particularly and certainly to know, what the real ſcheme is, as to biſhops in America. But certainly the non-conformiſts at leaſt, of all denominations, have great reaſon to deprecate the appointment of any *ſuch biſhops* here, as not only I had an idea of, when I tranſiently touched upon this ſubject before, but as I ſuppoſe, people here have generally had in view, when this affair has been diſcourſed of. The ſcheme mentioned by this gentleman is, without doubt, liable to fewer objections; and he ſpeaks of it with great aſſurance, as if he were at *head-quarters*, and certainly knew this to be the *real* and *only* one. Poſſibly this may be the caſe: But he is not *known*; nor has he informed us, upon what ground or authority he goes, in giving this account of the matter. The declaration of an *anonymous* writer, how confidently ſoever he may expreſs himſelf, is not, ſurely, ſufficient to ſatisfy us, that this is the *true* ſcheme planned. How much regard ſoever he might juſtly claim, if he were known to be a perſon of that eminence and dignity, which ſome of his expreſſions intimate him to be; yet while this is unknown,

† P. 66.

he will excuſe us if we do not intirely rely upon his word, that no *other* ſcheme has been propoſed. This may poſſibly be only his own ſcheme, the ſcheme of a private man: And, till it comes from better authority, or in a more authentic way, we may conſider it as an imaginary one, calculated to ſerve a preſent turn, or to lull us into ſecurity as to biſhops here, till, by the *real*, and much more *fatal* ſcheme's being carried into execution, it is too late to remonſtrate.

But let us for the preſent take it for granted, that this gentleman's is the *real* and *only* ſcheme. Let us ſuppoſe, that biſhops are to be *at firſt* ſent to America with ſuch limited powers, to reſide in epiſcopal colonies, and to have no concern, but with epiſcopalians: Have we ſufficient ground to think that they and their ſucceſſors would, to the day of doom, or for a long time, remain contented with ſuch powers, or under ſuch limitations? in a word, that they would continue ſuch inoffenſive, harmleſs creatures, as this gentleman ſuppoſes; only diffuſing *bleſſings* around them, on all manner of people *ſuſceptible of ſuch holy impreſſions*, as are made by their *hands* on the good people in England; ſo that we can reaſonably apprehend no miſchief from them? Has this order of men been remarkable for a quiet, inoffenſive behaviour? Have they uſually been free from ambitious views and projects? from a diſpoſition to intermeddle in ſecular, worldly matters, and to enlarge the ſphere of their domination?—from attempts to encroach upon the rights of mankind, religious or civil? from intriguing with princes, or the governors of countries, for their own advantage? from lending their aſſiſtance, and joining with them, in carrying on ſchemes of oppreſſion? Is it natural to ſuppoſe, that American biſhops would long content themſelves in a condition ſo inferior to that of their brethren, the *ſucceſſors* of the apoſtles in England? ---without any of their temporal power and grandieur, ſo as, in the eyes of moſt people, to appear of a lower order; and conſequently wanting that authority and reſpect which, it might be pleaded, is needful? Ambition and avarice never want plauſible pretexts, to accompliſh their end. The

gentleman

gentleman ſays, he cannot perceive why the people even of New-England, 'might not as ſafely *breath the ſame* 'air with a biſhop, as their brethren in Old England do. 'However (as he goes on) we are unwilling to diſquiet 'any of them, by importing and ſettling *amongſt them* a 'creature, which it ſeems ſome of them account to be ſo '*noxious*. Only we hope, that his occaſionally *travelling* '*thro' the country*, cannot *infect* it very dangerouſly.'* One, of ſuch a diſpoſition as he propoſes, might not: But what if, inſtead of this, he ſhould be another *Sacheverel?* (no impoſſible ſuppoſition.) And ſuch a man would probably be the moſt acceptable to the major part of the epiſcopal clergy, if not of the laity, in New-England. Might not *He* be a very *noxious* creature, *infect* the country in *travelling* thro' it, and diffuſe *plagues* inſtead of *bleſſings*, in his progreſs? What the gentleman ſays upon this head, brings to my mind what I have read of the aforeſaid great church-man: 'When the *ſpiritual hydra* began to belch 'forth his *poiſon*, when the---*prieſt* went his progreſs, *the* '*air was corrupted with his breath*, and the fell *contagion* 'ſpread itſelf far and near. The *ſnakes* which had lain 'long in the graſs, began to ſhow their heads, and hiſs; 'they *ſtung* many, and did *much miſchief*,' &c.‡

I am very remote from ſuſpecting, that this gentleman would think ſuch a perſon a proper one for a biſhop in America, or any where elſe; ſince he appears to be of a very different ſpirit himſelf. And it is intimated by him, that we ſhall have no ground for apprehenſions, ſince biſhops here, if any there are, will be appointed by the crown, and intirely dependent on the government in England; that *the ſmalleſt attempts towards an oppreſſive enlargement of ſpiritual power would be immediately cruſhed with indignation by the legiſlature there*; and that *both the moderation of the clergy, and the watchfulneſs of the laity over them* [God be thanked, if it be ſo] *are much more likely to increaſe than diminiſh.*† Theſe are good words, and fair ſpeeches; nor do I doubt, but that the gentleman ſpeaks his real ſentiments. But ſuppoſing all this; taking it alſo for

* P. 66. ‡ A Tract intitled *Prieſtianity*, &c. † p. 65.

for granted that, in the *preſent adminiſtration*, there has been a diſcovery of ſo much wiſdom and integrity, of ſuch a great regard to the *liberties* and *privileges* of the ſubject, and, particularly, of *ſuch a tender concern for the intereſt and proſperity of his Majeſty's American colonies*, as leaves us no room to fear an *oppreſſive enlargement of ſpiritual*, or *any other power*, during the continuance of it: All this being taken for granted, yet may not times alter, and adminiſtrations change? Who knows what the next reign and adminiſtration may be? or whether attempts towards an oppreſſive enlargement of power, may not be as much encouraged, as it is ſuppoſed they would be frowned on, during the preſent? We are certainly much more ſecure againſt ſuch oppreſſion, in the abſence of biſhops, than we ſhould be if they were once fixed here. *Obſta principiis*, was never thought an ill maxim by wiſe men. Biſhops being once fixed in America, pretexts might eaſily be found, both for encreaſing their number, and enlarging their powers: And theſe pretexts might probably be hearkened to, and prevail, on ſuch a change of times as may be ſuppoſed. To ſay the leaſt, this is much more to be apprehended, than it is that, on ſuch a change, biſhops ſhould be ſent hither at firſt with ſuch oppreſſive powers, or powers that interfere with the preſent rights and privileges of the *Coloniſts*. People are not uſually deprived of their liberties all at once, but gradually; by one encroachment after another, *as it is found they are diſpoſed to bear them*; and things of the moſt fatal tendency are often introduced at firſt, under a comparatively plauſible and harmleſs appearance. It cannot therefore be thought ſtrange, if we like the aforeſaid maxim, as to *oppoſing the firſt attempts*, in the preſent caſe; and are deſirous to keep the apprehended evil at as great a diſtance as may be. All prudent men act upon the ſame principle: Nor can I bring myſelf to reaſon as he did, who ſaid, *What hath poſterity done for us, that we ſhould be concerned for poſterity?* And ſhould biſhops be once fixed here, to me it is highly probable, that *our poſterity* will not find it half ſo difficult as this gentleman thinks it is for us now, before the experiment is made, to anſwer his

ſpirited

ſpirited demands, 'Where are the *perſecutors?* Where is 'the *dragon?*'† Eſpecially if it be true, as many affirm, that *high-church, tory-principles* and maxims are lately revived in England; and favour'd greatly by ſome, whoſe influence may go far towards bringing them into as much reputation, as they have been in diſgrace, ſince the death of Queen *Anne*.

The gentleman conſiders as perfectly chimerical, the apprehenſions which I formerly hinted, reſpecting the inconveniencies that might reſult from the appointment of biſhops in America: Particularly, that by the increaſe of the epiſcopal party, they might get a majority in our houſes of aſſembly; that, in conſequence hereof, the church of England might become the eſtabliſhed religion of all theſe colonies; that a ſacramental teſt, or ſomething like it, might enſue, to exclude non-conformiſts from places, preferment, and all civil offices, as in England; and that taxes might be impoſed on us all in common, for the maintenance of theſe biſhops, and the epiſcopal clergy. I did not, however, imagine that theſe dangers were very near at hand in New-England; nor do ſo now, conſidering the ſmall proportion that epiſcopalians bear to proteſtants of other denominations. Should biſhops be ſent, and the Society bend its whole force to increaſe the church among us, it is not probable that theſe events would ſpeedily take place. But even remote evils may be reaſonably apprehended, as well as thoſe which are imminent; and are to be guarded againſt, as much as may be. That appointing biſhops for America, would be a probable means of increaſing the epiſcopal party here, will not be denied: This is doubtleſs one principal reaſon, why it is ſo much deſired; tho' neither this gentleman, nor the Society, ſo far as I can at preſent recollect, has particularly mention'd it. There is, however, ſomething which looks a little this way in the *Abſtract* before-cited, wherein the reaſons for biſhops here, are enumerated; one of which is, 'to 'confirm *new converts* from *ſchiſm.*'‡ But even ſuppoſing a majority of epiſcopalians in the legiſlative body, in any

[*I*

†. P. 65. ‡ *Abſ.* 1715, p. 54.

[*I muſt not ſay* either, *becauſe there are more than* two] of theſe colonies; the gentleman aſks, 'Why ſhould a teſt law 'follow? Is there any ſuch law in the epiſcopal colonies? Or 'even tho' there were, can it be imagined, that if a prevailing 'party in Eew-England were wild enough to propoſe, his 'Majeſty would ever be adviſed to paſs one for that coun-'try?'† Whether there is any ſuch law already in any of the epiſcopal colonies, is with me a doubt. But by what I have obſerved of the over-bearing ſpirit of epiſcopalians *among us*, it is ſtrange to me if there is not. The very *Candid Examiner* of my *Obſervations*, plainly enough intimated his deſire of ſuch a law here: And if there were a conſiderable majority of epiſcopalians in the legiſlature, with a zealous, not to ſay *bigotted* and *oppreſſive* epiſcopalian Governor at their head, and biſhops in theſe parts to countenance and forward ſo *pious* a ſcheme for edifying the church; I make no doubt, but that the church of England would ſoon be eſtabliſhed here by a provincial law, and a teſt-act ſpeedily paſſed. Nor am I able to ſee any ground for the gentleman's great confidence, that the King would not be adviſed to allow ſaid teſt; ſeeing there is ſuch an one in our mother-country. I preſume, the gentleman could aſſign no ſolid reaſon for a teſt-law in England, by which *proteſtant* diſſenters are excluded from offices there, which would not hold good in favor of a law of the ſame tenor here; I mean, on the ſuppoſition of ſuch an increaſe and majority of the epiſcopal party. Can what is ſuppoſed reaſonable and equitable in Old England, be ſuppoſed unreaſonable and injurious in New? Or is it to be imagined, that the Head of the church of England would, at the deſire of the legiſlative body in any of his colonies, refuſe to allow of laws for eſtabliſhing ſaid church therein, and for introducing a teſt? laws manifeſtly adapted to the worldly grandieur, if not to the ſpiritual good of that church, which is at were *his body*; and to bring in, if not to *convince* ſchiſmatics? If the gentleman was able, I could wiſh he had done ſomething more towards removing our apprehenſions in this reſpect, than to treat them with ſcorn; which is not the moſt likely method to convince thoſe that think calmly of the matter. He

† P. 63.

He treats as ſtill more wild and chimerical, the ſuppoſition of our ever being taxed in common, for the ſupport of biſhops and their clergy. Says he, 'The terror of 'being taxed for biſhops, &c. - - - - is yet *more chimerical* 'than the former *'. But in caſe of ſuch an increaſe of the epiſcopal party, of the government's coming into their hands, and of the church of England's being here eſtabliſh'd by a provincial law, which things muſt be preſuppoſed; where is the abſurdity of ſuch an apprehenſion? I can ſee none, except it lies in the *injurious* and *oppreſſive* nature of ſuch a ſuppoſed tax: But this conſideration will never prevent the doubts and fears of thoſe, who reflect on what has been done in almoſt every age and country in chriſtendom, by the prevailing religious party, for their own eaſe, and the farther weakening and vexing the minority. The gentleman obſerves, that 'tithes are paid 'in England to the clergy by virtue of grants, which laid 'that burthen upon eſtates many ages before the preſent 'poſſeſſors enjoyed them'†. i. e. in the days of popery. He alſo expreſſes himſelf very poſitively, that if this had not been done, an act of parliament could not now be obtained, *of this or the like nature*, by which *diſſenters* in common with others, ſhould be taxed for the maintenance of the hierarchy. And having, for aught I can ſee, merely by his *peremptorineſs*, compleated his victory in this reſpect, he immediately begins his triumph, by ſaying: 'With what *modeſty* then can the Doctor ſuggeſt, that 'ſuch a thing might be feared in New-England ‡'? I am very glad, if the governing part of the nation have ſo much moderation reſpecting proteſtant diſſenters, that ſuch an act could not now be obtained there; which might, as it appears to me, be juſtly looked on as a great hardſhip, or inſtance of oppreſſion. It may naturally be ſuppoſed, this gentleman is of the ſame opinion: Why elſe could not an act of that nature be now obtained, if the hierarchy were not already provided for, by virtue of grants, when popery was triumphant, which laid the *burthen* of tythes on eſtates? But I do not pretend to have a thorough underſtanding of the *doctrine* of tythes, as *profeſſed* and *preached* in the church of England, never having made this any,

* P. 63. † Ibid. ‡ Pag. 64.

much leſs a principal part of *my ſtudy*, however important an *article* it may be.

Be this matter as it may, while there is a law in force, which bears ſo hard on proteſtant diſſenters, as the teſt does, I ſhall not eaſily be perſwaded, that it would be impoſſible, if the hierarchy was not already provided for, to obtain an act for that purpoſe, by which the burthen ſhould be laid upon diſſenters in common with others; which, in ſome reſpects, might be thought a leſs grievance than the other: Particularly as it would be much leſs *reproachful* and *ignominious* to them, to be only obliged to pay to the ſupport of a clergy diſapproved by them, than to be treated as if they did not merit the character, and were therefore unworthy to enjoy the privileges, of Britiſh ſubjects; tho' it is well known, his Majeſty, whom God preſerve, has none more loyal and faithful. But to return: If biſhops are ſent to America, they muſt be well ſupported; this is beyond doubt. By whom? or by what means? I ſuppoſe there is not yet a fund provided by legacies, near adequate to the ſupport of one; it not being a *ſmall matter*, that ſuffices ſuch dignified and *apoſtolical* perſons. The Society will probably think, this burthen ſhould not lie upon them; as they are not able to ſupport a ſufficient number of miſſions among people, whoſe neceſſities are great and urgent. Is it likely then, that the Britiſh nation, ſo deeply plunged in debt, and in which there is ſcarce a poſſibility of laying any new taxes, will undertake to maintain biſhops for America? No ſurely. Will the biſhops and rich clergy in England do it, *out of their abundance?* This is at leaſt as improbable; eſpecially ſince it is ſuppoſed, that many of them cannot, to this day, be intirely perſwaded, but that it is rather *more bleſſed to* receive *than to* give. Will American biſhops then, truſt to the generoſity of the people here; depending upon *providence* and *alms*, or, in other words, upon the good-will of the Americans? Will they be content without *reaping* any other *carnal things* here, than what the people may judge an adequate recompence for the *ſpiritual things ſown* by them; particularly (ſince biſhops ſeldom *preach*) for *confirming weak brethren*, and for *thoſe holy impreſſions* made by their *hands*, on *all manner of people ſuſceptible thereof?*

of? If this is all, or the principal part of what they receive, their maintenance will not probably half *ſatisfy* them; except perhaps at firſt, while wonderful effects are expected from their *bleſſing*, and the *benign influence of their function*: Nor will they run this riſque, unleſs they have more faith in God, and leſs love to the *world*, than moſt of their order have had, ſince *Conſtantine* the Great became a *nurſing father* to the church, and the pious, *maternal* council of *Nice* ſuckled her with the clear and pure, the uncorrupt and 'ſincere milk' of *Homöouſianity*, that ſhe might 'grow thereby'. Can there then be a more probable ſuppoſition than this; That in conſequence of the epiſcopal party's increaſing in theſe colonies, and becoming a majority in the legiſlatures, the church of England would be eſtabliſhed by provincial laws, and the people in common taxed for the ſupport of biſhops and their clergy? Have we reaſon to think that, from brotherly affection and tenderneſs for *ſchiſmaticks*, they would exempt them from bearing a part of this burthen? I wiſh there was not more reaſon to apprehend, that they would oblige non-conformiſts to bear a double proportion of it; not, to be ſure, out of any enmity, but only as an inſtance of *wholeſome ſeverity*, and a probable means of bringing them into the boſom of the church, to their eternal ſalvation—However, if a law for an equal tax upon conformiſts and non-conformiſts were paſſed in any Britiſh colony, for the purpoſe aforeſaid, there is ſcarce any room to doubt, but that it would be confirmed by the crown: The Head muſt take care for the good of the body, and all its members. Nay, if biſhops were ſpeedily to be ſent to America, it ſeems not wholly improbable, from what we hear of the *unuſual* tenor of ſome late parliamentary acts and bills, for raiſing money on the poor colonies *without their conſent*, that proviſion might be made for the ſupport of theſe biſhops, if not of all the church clergy alſo, in the *ſame way*.

The gentleman having endeavoured to expoſe to ridicule the aforeſaid apprehenſions, as perfectly *chimerical*, and called my *modeſty* as well as underſtanding in queſtion, even for hinting them, immediately adds: 'Beſides, would it have 'been a good reaſon at the *revolution*, for debarring the diſ'ſenters from the full exerciſe of their church government

'and worſhip, that if they obtain'd it, they might perhaps 'increaſe till they got a *major vote* in both houſes, and then 'enact no mortal knows what.'* Theſe caſes, it is conceived, are much too diſſimilar, to argue thus from one to the other. The church of England had an excluſive legal eſtabliſhment, at the time ſpoken of; the King for her Head, and ſworn Protector, and almoſt all perſons of intereſt and power for her members. Conformity was almoſt, if not the only path to preferment, civil honors, offices and emoluments. In ſhort, the conſtitution both in church and ſtate was ſo ſecured, ſo guarded both by laws and numbers, and non-conformiſts were ſo few, and under ſuch diſadvantages, that there was not room for any fear that they would ever increaſe ſo as to become the major and leading part in parliament, or be able, if they deſired it, to over-turn the eſtabliſhment, and oppreſs epiſcopalians. Apprehenſions of this ſort, would indeed have been perfectly *chimerical* at that time; eſpecially conſidering the diſunion of non-conformiſts among themſelves, and the moral impoſſibility of their uniting, in eſtabliſhing any other particular form of church government. What parity? what ſimilitude is there between the circumſtances of New England and Old, in theſe reſpects? The caſes are ſo widely different, that it is ſtrange a gentleman of ſo much penetration and acumen ſhould, by his manner of reaſoning, ſuppoſe them parallel. We have no *ſuch* eccleſiaſtical eſtabliſhment, as that of England; and, I hope, never ſhall. Our churches have no royal Head and Protector, in the ſenſe which that has;—*only* ONE *in heaven*, whom we pray to be the *Protector* of the other. We are not an independent people, or ſovereign ſtate, but dependent on England, wherein epiſcopacy is eſtabliſhed, and which we honor and obey, as our mother-country. Our Governor, and all provincial Governors appointed by the crown, I ſuppoſe are, and by law muſt be, conformiſts to the church of England. A conſiderable number of perſons, even in the N. England colonies, are perſons of much wealth, influence and power. In moſt of the colonies, the reſpective Governors have all military offices at their free diſpoſal and the nomination to civil; and in ſome, a negative on the choice of councellors. They muſt alſo be ſuppoſed, as a thing of courſe,

* Pag. 64.

courſe, moſt to favor epiſcopalians; ſo that conformity, inſtead of being a bar to preferment here, is perhaps generally found the readieſt way to it. Epiſcopalians may be, and often are, choſen members of both houſes of aſſembly in the colonies of New England; nor is there either law, or any thing elſe, to prevent this, if, by their qualifications and good behaviour, they can recommend themſelves to the electors. And I hope this gentleman would not have the people *obliged* by law to chuſe them, whether they approve of them or not; tho' this ſeems to be the amount of what he ſome-where ſays. Beſides, the epiſcopalians here are more united among themſelves than we are, being of different ſects and parties. And ſhould they [epiſcopalians] hereafter approach any thing near to an equality with us in point of number, they will have the advantage greatly in this reſpect; ſince they may more eaſily unite their ſtrength, in purſuing meaſures for their ſeparate advantage, and to *our* common detriment, than we ſhall our's, in any particular methods of oppoſition to them: So that they may carry their points, even with *inferior* numbers; eſpecially being moſt favour'd by an epiſcopal Governor, whoſe influence is ordinarily very great *out of court*, as well as his proper conſtitutional power *in it*.

Our circumſtances being ſuch, is there not a hundred, a thouſand times, more reaſon to apprehend that epiſcopalians may in time become the major and governing party here, and enact ſuch laws as I have been ſpeaking of, than there was at the *revolution*, that the non-conformiſts in England might do the like there? I can hardly think that the gentleman, upon a little reflection, will diſown it. Which being the caſe, the grand principle on which he ſets out, in ſpeaking of American biſhops, is not applicable to the ſtate of theſe colonies; at leaſt, not by far, very far, ſo applicable as it was and is to that of England. The principle I intend, is this, That 'all members of every church are, according 'to the principles of liberty, intitled to *every part* of what 'they conceive to be the benefits of it, intire and compleat, '*ſo far as conſiſts with the welfare of civil government*' *. It is readily owned, that our apprehenſion of what may poſſibly or probably be the conſequences of biſhops being ſent hither,

* Pag 59.

hither, ought not to put us on infringing the *religious liberty* of our fellow ſubjects, & *chriſtian brethren*, if they will pardon this freedom: Neither have we any power to do ſo, if we were unreaſonable and wicked enough to deſire it; *our charter* granting ſuch liberty to *all proteſtants*. But the epiſcopalians here may enjoy this liberty, as they now do, without biſhops in America, tho' under ſome inconveniencies; principally perhaps, for want of *holy impreſſions* made by their *hands* in the ceremony of confirmation; their *lack* of which, it muſt be owned, is ſometimes but too viſible in their *behaviour*. We are therefore, methinks, very excuſeable, if we expreſs a *reluctance* at the propoſal of a ſcheme, which we really apprehend may bring great trouble and temporal inconveniencies upon us; and be the ſource of much diviſion, diſcord, and confuſion: Eſpecially, if it be alſo a ſcheme tending to promote that particular mode or profeſſion of chriſtianity among us, which we cannot but think, on the whole, much leſs conformable to the goſpel, and therefore leſs conducive to the eternal happineſs of mankind, than that which at preſent generally prevails among us.

But one thing mentioned by this gentleman, in order to reconcile us to this ſcheme, had almoſt eſcaped me. It is this: '*Popiſh biſhops* reſide *here*,' ſays he, 'and go about 'to exerciſe *every part* of their function, without offence 'and without obſervation'†. But this has a much leſs tendency to reconcile us to the propoſal about American biſhops, than to give us an alarm for the welfare of our mother county; with which, we are very ſenſible, our own is connected. If popiſh biſhops exerciſe their function in England *without obſervation*, as the gentleman ſays, it is not indeed ſtrange, if they do it alſo *without offence*. But I cannot readily comprehend what he means by ſaying, that they do this *without obſervation*, when at the ſame time he ſpeaks of it as a notorious fact: Tho' his meaning cannot be miſtaken, when he ſays, this is done *without offence*. It muſt be, that it gives no conſiderable umbrage or jealouſy, but that the people, at leaſt thoſe of higher rank, are contented it ſhould be ſo. For he ſpeaks of this as an inſtance and proof of the mutual candor, forbearance and moderation,

† Pag. 66.

tion, which prevail at this day in England, among chriſtians of different denominations; and ſo, as a reaſon why we ſhould be well ſatisfied with having biſhops of the church of England in theſe parts. But if this proves any thing, it proves too much; *viz.* that we ſhould be content to ſee, not only Engliſh, but popiſh biſhops, freely exerciſing their functions among us; the latter of which is not agreeable to our charter and laws. And tho' I am a warm friend to religious liberty in the largeſt ſenſe; and tho' mutual forbearance cannot be too much recommended, where the differences are *merely* of a *religious* nature, or ſuch as do not affect the liberty, ſafety and natural rights of mankind; yet I muſt own, I hope never to ſee popiſh biſhops thus going about *without offence*, in New-England; being perſuaded, from the very nature of divers popiſh tenets, that roman catholicks cannot be ſafely tolerated in the free exerciſe of their religion, in a proteſtant government. And, if I may be permitted to make a ſort of digreſſion here, does not the prevalence of popery in England, afford matter for very ſerious reflexions? The papiſts, only in London, were by computation an hundred thouſand, in the year 1745. Since which, their numbers are vaſtly increaſed there, and in other parts of the kingdom; the people being, as it is ſaid, perverted by popiſh biſhops, prieſts, jeſuits, &c. by hundreds and thouſands, if not ten thouſands, yearly. Nor is this, as it ſeems, done in ſecret, and in corners; but openly and boldly, as this gentleman intimates. And has not a *very large* maſs-houſe been built ſince 1745, in Stanhope-Street, London, contiguous to the houſe of the Neapolitan ambaſſador; which has a door always open to another ſtreet, on purpoſe to *accommodate the public?* What is become of the ſmall, old, crazed popiſh chapel, call'd the Sardinian chapel? Was it not burnt two or three years ago, probably with a politic deſign, by the papiſts themſelves, preſuming that they had many friends, and but few zealous and powerful enemies? I mean, with a deſign to rebuild, greatly enlarge and adorn it. Has not this actually been done? tho', to be ſure, not intirely *without obſervation*; ſince the chapel has now an organ, to catch the attention of the lovers of muſic. And has not the ſaid chapel been boldly ſpoken of in a public advertiſement,

advertiſement, doubtleſs by the papiſts, to invite the idle and curious thither, as *one of the* HANDSOMEST *places of* WORSHIP *about town?* Is it not ſurprizing, if theſe and ſuch like things are, indeed, tranſacted in the metropolis, without any oppoſition from, or *offence* to, perſons of rank? even the venerable biſhops and Society, who are ſo zealous to ſupport and propagate the proteſtant church of England *abroad*; and, according to this gentleman, ſo very ſolicitous to preſerve the Britiſh colonies from *popiſh ſuperſtition* and *idolatry?*—even thoſe colonies, in which there are *no popiſh biſhops* or *prieſts*, and hardly a *papiſt!* While they are ſo charitable to us remote Coloniſts, are theſe things done before their eyes *without offence?* Particularly, do the popiſh biſhops, without giving them any umbrage, *go about to exerciſe* EVERY PART *of their function?*— ſuch as *ordaining prieſts, uniting the* [popiſh] *clergy*, making *proſelytes, confirming new converts from ſchiſm*, with other *weak brethren* of that communion; and *bleſſing all manner of people, ſuſceptible of ſuch* holy impreſſions, *as are made by the impoſition of biſhops hands*; with many *et cætera's!* What? All this, *without offence* to ſuch zealous proteſtants! How can that be?— Is popery more harmleſs in its nature and tendency; and therefore leſs *offenſive*, now than formerly? Is it leſs dangerous, either to the ſouls or bodies of men? leſs perillous to the eternal ſalvation of its proſelytes and profeſſors, or to the temporal ſafety of proteſtant communities? If not, how can we account for theſe things being tranſacted *without offence* to ſuch good proteſtants, as the venerable Society and biſhops? How would America be better ſecured againſt popery, by having ſuch biſhops here? And if not againſt popery, how, againſt other pernicious errors? Or do their Lordſhips and the Society love New England better than Old? or America better than Europe? Are they more ſolicitous for our welfare, than for their own, and the ſafety of the good people of England? Is the infernal gun-powder plot? are other treaſonable and execrable conſpiracies of Engliſh papiſts, forgotten? Is the horrid maſſacre of the proteſtants in Ireland? is that on *Black Bartholomew* in Paris, one of which at leaſt was ever

ever applauded by the popes and papiſts,† no more remembered? Are all their diabolical treacheries and cruelties buried in oblivion? Can they who believe the Pope's ſupremacy over all Kings, and conſequently deny the independency of the Britiſh crown and empire, poſſibly be good loyal ſubjects to King GEORGE, or any other proteſtant King? Are there no laws now in force againſt papiſts? or is there nó-body to execute them? Is the ſword of the law ruſted in the hands of the magiſtrates, as well as that of the Spirit, where it is ſaid ſo *rarely* to come, in the mouths of the prelates? One would ſuſpect both, from the account this gentleman gives of popiſh biſhops going openly about, to perform *every part* of their function *without offence!* But how will the gentleman well reconcile this with what he elſe-where ſays; that the Roman-catholics *hate* the church of England *more* than they do others, 'as the *moſt dangerous enemy* to their 'cauſe, and *ſtrongeſt bulwark* of the reformation?'* Surely, they have no reaſon to do ſo, if ſuch things are tranſacted in England *without offence*. I could wiſh he had explained himſelf a little farther, upon ſo intereſting a point.

Poſſibly the gentleman, who can be very *arch* when he pleaſes, intended by writing thus, to give a public hint, that there was a blameable remiſſneſs in the proteſtant biſhops and their clergy, if not in ſome *other perſons*, with reference to popiſh biſhops going about ſo freely, and to the great and dangerous increaſe of popery in England, without any *offence* taken thereat. I can, ſometimes, hardly forbear looking on this as a piece of deſigned ſevere and cutting, tho' diſguiſed *ſatire*, on the prelates at leaſt,

† Le ſucceſſeur de *St. Pierre* et ſon conſiſtoire ne peuvent errer; ils approvèrent, célébrèrent, conſacrèrent l'action de la *St. Barthelemi*; donc cette action était très ſainte; donc de deux aſſaſſins *égaux en piété*, celui qui aurait éventré vingt quatre femmes groſſes huguenotes, doit être élevé en gloire du double de celui qui n'en aura éventré que douze. *Traité ſur la Tolérance*. By M. *Voltaire*, (according to common fame) under a diſguiſe. * Page 4.

if not on the adminiſtration. But whatever might be his real deſign, as to which I am in ſome doubt, one would think that, according to the repreſentation he has given, whether juſt or not, there was at this day in England great occaſion for

> ----------'honeſt zeal,
> 'To rouſe the watchmen of the public weal,
> 'To virtue's work provoke the tardy hall,
> 'And goad the prelate ſlumbering in his ſtall.'†

I am far enough from pretending to know, farther ſtill from preſuming to ſay, what the true ſtate of things *now* is in England. But it is ſufficiently apparent, what have in times *paſt* been the reaſons why the pernicious practices of papiſts, and the increaſe of popery there, have been winked at. At ſome times the King and the miniſtry, the principal biſhops, and other eccleſiaſtic dignitaries, together with ſome of the magiſtrates, have ſeemed really inclined to a thoro' coaleſcence with the church of Rome: Witneſs ſome, at leaſt, of the *Stuart*-reigns. At other times, it ſeems, a corrupt, abandon'd miniſtry have both had occaſion for, and by concert received, the parliamentary intereſt of the wealthier papiſts: In conſequence of which, and as a grateful return for the favor, (if ſuch perſons can be ſuppoſed to have any gratitude) they have wholly connived at the practices and perverſions of papiſts. The magiſtrates of courſe became leſs watchful, more remiſs and inactive. The clergy, eſpecially thoſe of ſuperior rank, and who aimed at riches or higher preferment, or both, obſerving this conduct of the miniſtry, and the path neceſſary *in commendam*, wholly connived alſo at the practices of papiſts, and the progreſs of popery; except perhaps they *coldly* appeared againſt them on certain days and occaſions, of mere neceſſity and form. So that, at ſuch times, cruel, blood-thirſty and rebel-hearted roman-catholics, had hardly any oppoſition made to them, or any thing to fear in England, either from law or goſpel.

† Pope.

pel. A few learned, honeſt and active men, who aimed leſs at preferment in the church, than at the ſafety and good of their country, have indeed ſtepped forth at ſuch times, to oppoſe this maſter-hydra of popery: But being moſtly poor, with little influence or intereſt, and unſupported by their ſuperiors, who ought to have been foremoſt in this oppoſition, the public received but little benefit from their virtuous and heroic endeavours, exerted to a certain detriment in their promotion, and to their perſonal diſadvantage. By ſuch-like means has the *Scarlet Whore*, with whom the Kings and great men of the earth have committed *fornication*, at certain ſeaſons got fairly mounted on her *horned beaſt*, and rode, with the cup of *abominations* in her hand, almoſt triumphant thro' England: Seeming to want only a little more time, and a favourable concurrence of circumſtances, by means of foreign or domeſtic broils and jarrings, to ſhew her execrable, infernal face in its moſt hideous attitudes, and to exert a bloody, fiery, diabolical ſtrength; the utmoſt conſequences of which, no one could foreſee, but all had great reaſon to dread! Such has heretofore been the ſtate of things in England. How it is at preſent, I pretend not particularly to know. But, as was intimated before, I could wiſh that my penetrating and able opponent, who is on the ſpot, had explained himſelf a little farther, when he hinted that popery was faſt gaining ground there, and appeared ſo boldly; yet *without offence!* For this digreſſion, methinks, he ought to be partly reſponſible, ſince he gave the occaſion; and I hope he will be ſo good as to ſhare the blame with me. It is not, however, I think, entirely foreign from my ſubject, as was hinted before: For, ſurely, biſhops, or other perſons, who are ſo little inimical to popery, as to take no *offence* at popiſh biſhops going about to exerciſe *every part* of their function in England, if this be really the caſe, are not likely to be of much ſervice to the proteſtant religion, in the character of biſhops in America. I am very ſure, there

are none of our *unorthodox* New-England clergy, but what would be both greatly *offended* and *alarmed* at ſuch things; ſound a loud alarm to the people of their paſtoral charge, and exert themſelves to the utmoſt, to prevent the fatal effects that might be apprehended from the practices of *his* miniſters and agents, *who oppoſeth and exalteth himſelf above all that is called God, or that is worſhipped*; and *whoſe coming is after the working of Satan, with all power, and ſigns, and lying wonders, and with all deceivableneſs of unrighteouſneſs in them that periſh.* But notwithſtanding the great elevation and authority of the Engliſh biſhops, this gentleman ſays: 'That any of them are ſo high, as to 'do *harm*, or *cauſe fear*, by their elevation, the perſons 'amongſt whom they live, *find not*.'* And in this, it is likely, the papiſts and popiſh biſhops will agree with him, if it be true, as he intimates, that the latter exerciſe *every part* of their function *without offence* to them: Which may, perhaps, help to explain his meaning in the words aforeſaid.

Poſſibly, tho' I am not willing to ſuppoſe, the gentleman may ſay of me on this occaſion, as he did on another: 'But why—ſuch diſmal apprehenſions? why ſuch out-'cries? where are the perſecutors? where is the dragon? 'All the world muſt ſee, the Doctor himſelf muſt ſee, 'that this *declamation* is foreign from the purpoſe; and 'on his firſt recollection, he ſhould have *been aſhamed of* 'it, and have *ſtruck it out*. But paternal tenderneſs 'would not let him deſtroy ſo *pathetic a rant* on ſo *dar-'ling a ſubject*†'. The former, and this preſent *ſubject*, are not wholly *diſſimilar*; I thank God they are not more nearly *alike*. With me they are both important, though in very unequal degrees. But if this gentleman and I had taken each other's counſel as to *ſtriking out*, on one ſide *pathetic rants* and *declamations*, and on the other, I will not ſay *unanimated*, but *cool*, yet *inconcluſive reaſonings*, it is probable that both our *Tracts* would have been reduced

* Page 5. † p. 65.

reduced to a much *ſmaller* ſize: And who, on this ſuppoſition, would have had moſt grief, reſulting from *paternal tenderneſs*, I cannot, and preſume he will not, very poſitively determine.

I have freely and fully laid open my thoughts, ſuch as they are, reſpecting the New England miſſions. I have alſo explained myſelf as to the propoſition concerning biſhops in America; and though not ſo fully, yet more particularly than I intended to do; having been almoſt compelled to it, at once by this gentleman's formal attack upon a few expreſſions, which occaſionally dropped from my pen, and by his great courteſy in attempting to propoſe my objections *diſtinctly for me*, becauſe he thought I was *a great deal too vehement* to do it myſelf. By what has now been ſaid, he may perceive, at leaſt that he has not wholly diſſipated 'the poor man's fears,'† either by his reaſoning or rallying on the ſubject. I have attended to his ſerious requeſt, at the concluſion of his argument—'If he is *ſtill diſſatisfied*, I intreat him to conſider, for all 'men ought, *what manner of ſpirit he is of*.‖' *Still diſſatisfied* I am: and, I hope, from ſuch a *ſpirit* as he will not wholly diſapprove, however wrong he may think my *opinions*;---from a love to *truth*, cultivated in my early days; from a love to what I take to be the *moſt primitive chriſtianity*; from a ſincere concern for the *welfare of my country*; and an apprehenſion that this ſcheme of biſhops, if put in execution, will be greatly *detrimental* to it, both in *civil* and *religious* reſpects. This, I think, is the *ſpirit*, from which my *diſatisfaction* chiefly ariſes. The gentleman has doubtleſs well conſidered, from *what ſpirit it is*, that he is *ſo much ſet upon this ſcheme of biſhops*; and it would be very uncharitable in me, to conclude it a *bad one*; as I do not, whatever I may think of the ſcheme itſelf. However, I think it but juſtice to him to acknowledge, that if ſuch a ſcheme as he has propoſed were to be put in execution, and *only* ſuch conſequences were

† Page 64. ‖ p. 67.

were to follow, as he *profeſſedly* has in view, as the ends aimed at, I could not object againſt it; except only upon the ſame principle, that I object againſt the church of England *in general*, and ſhould be ſorry, from a regard to what I ſuppoſe a more ſcriptural way of worſhip, to ſee that church prevail here: Which yet, I ſolemnly declare, I would not prevent, tho' it were abſolutely in my own power, by any methods inconſiſtent with that full, entire liberty in religious matters, which I deſire for myſelf; and which all men, whoſe principles or practices are not inconſiſtent with the ſafety of ſociety, have a right to enjoy. Thus far I have the honor fully to agree with this gentleman.

I hope I have not treated the gentleman with any rudeneſs or indecency. There is much good ſenſe, good temper, candor and chriſtian catholiciſm diſcovered in various parts of his Tract. The venerable Society, I believe, never had ſo able, and never will have a more able defender:

'.....Si Pergama dextrâ
'Defendi poſſent, etiam *hâc* defenſa fuiſſent.'

He has, I think, once or twice expreſſed himſelf *civilly* even of me, tho' never without blaming me at the ſame time. I would not be wanting in a ſuitable return: But if it ſo happens, that the neceſſary conſequence of attending to any gentleman's reaſoning, is his appearing ſometimes in a leſs advantageous light than at others, it is not difficult to ſee where the blame lies. Nor is the difference ſmall, between going out of one's way, on purpoſe to give murderous thruſts to the *reputation* of a writer, and barely not preventing him from being too careleſs of it himſelf, and uſing it very unkindly, by undertaking to defend what is not defenſible. This performance is doubtleſs, in all reſpects, much ſuperior to any of thoſe which *firſt* appeared againſt the *Obſervations* in America. And, upon the whole, by what I can learn, it is written with

with too much catholicism, and too little rancor againſt *me*, to be generally acceptable to the epiſcopalians among us: Which are probably the chief reaſons, why there was ſo much difficulty in obtaining a *ſubſcription* for reprinting it in Boſton.

But tho' there is too much charity and moderation diſcovered in many parts of this Tract, to pleaſe the taſte of ſome among us; yet, methinks, the gentle author has at times, *when off his guard*, uſed me in ſuch a manner as might almoſt have *ſatisfied* them; and poſſibly, upon a review of ſome paſſages, they may have an higher opinion of this performance in that reſpect; among which, I beg leave particularly to recommend to them the following, all relating to me and my *Obſervations*—'He 'contents himſelf with—reproachful names, and ludicrous 'repreſentations; a likely method to pleaſe the prejudiced, 'and lead the thoughtleſs along with him.' *Anſwer* p. 4. 'What he means--- beſides indeterminate abuſe,' p. 5.— '—had better judge by the experience of others, than by 'his own heated imagination.' *Ibid.*—'he hath not ex-'plained what his own [trade] is. But certainly reviling 'his brethren is a very bad one,' p. 6. 'Some perſons are 'ſtrangely ſubject to violent guſts of paſſion---- his ma-'lady hath a deeper root in his frame, and influenceth 'him more conſtantly'—p. 9.— 'an artful deſign to 'procure himſelf a diſpenſation for his outrages,' *Ibid.*— 'frequent and copious effuſions of a bad ſpirit in his work,' p 10.—'place ſome part of his religion in railing at epiſ-'copalians,' p. 31.—'according to the old cuſtom of 'his party—of diſcharging miſ-applied texts of ſcripture 'in the faces of ſuch as happened to offend them,' p. 55. 'The poor man's fears, if you will believe him, run 'to vaſtly farther lengths yet,' p. 64.—'ſo pathetic a 'rant on ſo darling a ſubject,' p. 65.—'wit and archneſs '— would have been too great a ſacrifice [for him] to 'make to dull truth and fact,' p. 66.

Theſe

Theſe and ſome other of his *compliments*, however agreeable they may be to others, I own, I do not very well reliſh myſelf; and the leſs, becauſe they may poſſibly ſerve, *in ſome meaſure*, to keep in *countenance* my American antagoniſts in this controverſy; who have obſerved *no meaſures* in their abuſes and invectives. But I can bear, without returning, ſuch language as this; eſpecially as this courtly gentleman intimates, that theſe 'freedoms' ſhould 'not be imputed to any *unkinder* motive',* than that *of ſhewing me to myſelf*; and that, if I 'amend upon admonition,' ſo *tenderly* adminiſtred, I may be entitled to ſome *reſpect*. I deſire to amend all my faults, which are far, very far, too many. Nor will I deny, but that I am in ſome meaſure deſirous to procure reſpect, by fair and honorable means; eſpecially reſpect from a perſon, for whom I have ſo ſincere a one myſelf, as I have for my *kind* admoniſher.

The gentleman, after having ſpoken of me in ſuch terms as the aforeſaid, is ſo charitable as to make an *apology* for me, by obſerving, that I *ſeem to have naturally a moſt vehement ſpirit*, and to have *imbibed, perhaps in my early days, equally vehement prepoſſeſſions againſt the very name of biſhops, and every thing* connected *with them.*— 'I am ſenſible,' adds he, 'that theſe things plead in his 'excuſe,' &c. † My natural temper is perhaps too warm: And I own, that early in life, I imbibed ſtrong *prepoſſeſſions* againſt dioceſan biſhops; i. e. if a full perſuaſion, the reſult of free enquiry and reading, that their order itſelf is unſcriptural, and that they have generally been a pernicious ſet of men, both to church and ſtate, may properly be called *prepoſſeſſion*. And if theſe things plead in my *excuſe* for any unwarrantable expreſſions uſed by me, I am much obliged to the gentleman for his candor in ſuggeſting it. What his own *early prepoſſeſſions* might poſſibly be, in *favor* of epiſcopacy, and ſome things *connected with it*, I forbear to conjecture; leſt I ſhould fall

* Page 67. † Ibid.

fall into a miſtake that might be *offenſive* to him: Which I chuſe to avoid. If the gentleman labors under any *natural* foible, ſimilar to that which he ſuppoſes in me, I am extremely deſirous that he ſhould reap all the advantage from it, as a plea in his *excuſe*, that he charitably propoſes I ſhould reap from mine; and ſo, while he is far happier in many excellencies, may alſo have more cauſe to *glory in his infirmities*.* But if, on the contrary, he is naturally of a *cool, diſpaſſionate temper*; tho' I ſincerely congratulate him on his felicity in that reſpect, yet I cannot but expreſs my ſorrow, that this puts it out of my power to return his civility, by making as handſome an apology for ſome expreſſions that have eſcaped him, as he has made for ſome of mine.

I am indeed, even literally a 'poor man,' as this gentleman calls me, I ſuppoſe, in another ſenſe: And in that reſpect I have been publicly upbraided by ſome of the *very decent* writers againſt the *Obſervations*; nor has even the honeſt, irreproachable memory of my *Father* wholly eſcaped their inſults. However, thro' the goodneſs of God, and the generoſity of his people, I have a comfortable ſubſiſtence, with contentment: Which, if but attended with *integrity* and *godlineſs*, is all the *gain* that my ſoul aſpires after in this world. Let me add, on this occaſion, that I had much rather be the *poor* ſon of a good man, who ſpent a long life and his patrimony in the humble and laborious, tho' apoſtolical employment of preaching 'the unſearchable riches of Chriſt' to *poor Indians*; and One, as I ſuppoſe, now at reſt from his labors with 'the ſpirits of juſt men made perfect'; than even the *rich* ſon and heir of One who had, by temporizing in religion, and tampering with politics, by flattering the Great, and proſtituting his conſcience, made his way to a biſhoprick, and the worldly dignity of a peer; how large a *bag* ſoever he had carried with him thro' a life of idleneſs and pride, of intrigue and luxury, or left behind him at death, the *black period* of all his greatneſs and glory.

* 2 Cor. xii. 5 & 10.

The good gentleman concludes his performance in ſuch a ſenſible, candid and charitable way, as does him great honor; and ſhews the amiable ſpirit of chriſtianity in an advantageous light. I can, however, hardly ſuppoſe, that if he had ever ſeen certain outrageous publications of the American epiſcopalians againſt me, relating to the Society and the church, he would have expreſſed himſelf in ſo cautious and tender a manner as he has there done, after having reproved and admoniſhed me, with ſome ſeverity, *tho' only for my good*: Since he is doubtleſs as *kindly* diſpoſed towards *them*, as towards me. 'IF any writers on '*our ſide*,' ſays he, 'have been *leſs cool*, or *leſs civil*, than 'they ought, and *deſigned* [*to be ſure*] to have been, we 'are ſorry for it, and exhort them to *change their ſtile*, 'if they write again.'† Methinks, One that appears partly in the character of a *moderator* and *peace-maker* among warm diſputants, ought, not only to abſtain from all ſuch contemptuous and opprobrious language as he blames in them, but to be *impartial* in his reproofs and admonitions. For which reaſon I conclude, this worthy gentleman was an utter ſtranger to ſome late writings of the epiſcopalians here; which would, no doubt, if he had ſeen them, have extorted even from a perſon of his mild, meek and gentle diſpoſition, a *ſharp rebuke*, inſtead of ſuch a *gingeriſh exhortation*.

Tho' Mr. *Apthorp* kept to his prudent reſolution, 'once for all;' and has been *dead* as to this diſpute, ever ſince he began it in form; this gentleman has revived the *remembrance* of him, by ſometimes mentioning him, endeavouring to defend divers of his moſt unjuſtifiable poſitions, and blaming me for treating him 'unmercifully,' &c. All which I conſider as the effect of his great *humanity*, rather than the reſult of his *deliberate* judgment. And tho' I have had frequent occaſions, yet I have, as much as poſſible, avoided ſpeaking of that gentleman; leſt, in my own vindication, I ſhould have been almoſt obliged to tranſgreſs the old maxim, *De mortuis nil niſi bonum*.

Plauſible

† P. 68.

Plauſible colors may be put upon almoſt any thing, however falſe or wrong in itſelf, by men of great ingenuity, and *fine ſenſe*. But *plain, common ſenſe*, with a competent knowledge of *facts* and *circumſtances*, (which, to be ſure, is the utmoſt that I can pretend to) and much more, an equal capacity on the ſide of truth and right, will ever have the advantage in an argument. This will, commonly at leaſt, be able to ſhew, that round is not ſquare, or black white; to ſtrip a bad cauſe of the *ingenious* gloſſes put upon it; to puff away the duſt, and bruſh off the flimzy, cobweb reaſonings that are ſpread over it, to keep it from appearing what it is.

'Spin all your cobwebs o'er the eye of day!
'The muſe's wing ſhall bruſh them all away.---
'All, all but *truth*, drops dead-born *from the preſs*,
'Like the laſt *Gazette*, or the laſt *Addreſs*.---
'Not Waller's wreath can hide the nation's ſcar,
'Nor Boileau turn the FEATHER to a STAR.'†

'That which is *crooked* cannot be made *ſtrait*.' I will not apply this; it will be done by others, if it is in any meaſure applicable to the caſe in hand---But to draw to a cloſe of theſe *Remarks*: Having, for ſome years, been not unacquainted with the religious ſtate of New-England, nor unknowing to many tranſactions relative thereto; I have ſincerely aimed at ſetting things in a true light, as to the miſſions here. A child may hold a candle to a man, or a weak and ſimple man to a wiſe one; and thereby be of ſervice to him, while employed about matters of great importance and difficulty. If any thing has been offered by me, which, from the nature of it, juſtly claims attention, I hope it will not be entirely diſregarded, on account of any diſagreeable appendages. If I have ſaid nothing that deſerves any regard, I beg the venerable Society candidly to excuſe my well-meant officiouſneſs; as alſo to pardon any expreſſions uſed by me, which may ſeem not ſufficiently reſpectful. I think, whatever faults I may have, (would to God they were much fewer!) I am not of a temper deliberately to juſtify any thing, too haſtily

† Pope.

ſaid or done by me, after being convinced of the error. Tho' I may be thought to have ſaid ſome harſh things about the members of the church of England, and am often blamed in that reſpect by my worthy *Anſwerer*; I have repeatedly declared, and again declare, that I highly reſpect and honor many of them, as perſons of great probity, piety and goodneſs; particularly among thoſe who were *educated in that way.* Whatever my opinion may be of the conſtitution and worſhip of ſaid church, I ſhould be extremely glad to ſee a friendly, obliging intercourſe preſerved between her members among us, and people of our own perſuaſion: And notwithſtanding I am taxed with being uncharitable to, and *vehement* againſt them; I can ſay, with the ſincerity becoming a chriſtian, that whenever I happen to have any concern with any of them, who appear to me to be perſons of principle and candor, not over-bearing and aſſuming, but willing to treat non-conformiſts as their fellow-chriſtians and brethren; I take a very particular pleaſure in ſhewing them all the tokens of affection, eſteem and honor. But, I ſay it at once with grief and reluctance, I have much *ſeldomer* found perſons of this character among them, than I could have wiſhed to do; and contempt and diſdain on one ſide, very often produce the ſame on the other. However, I recollect a very juſt obſervation of the gentleman, to this purpoſe, That people of different religious ſects and parties may *think* much too *ill* of, without at all *wiſhing ill* to, each other. Both theſe are faults, which ought to be carefully guarded againſt: If I have ever fallen into the *firſt*, I hope I am not chargeable with the *ſecond;* which is far the moſt criminal and inexcuſeable. I likewiſe hope, we ſhall on all hands, as far as poſſible, put on that charity which *thinketh no evil;* which *ſuffereth long*, and is *kind;* which *envieth not*, *vaunteth not itſelf*, is not *puffed up;* which doth not *behave itſelf unſeemly; rejoiceth not in iniquity;* but *rejoiceth in the truth.* No one can read the ſacred oracles, unleſs he is ſpiritually blind, without clearly ſeeing, that tho' we had all faith, as well as all knowledge, ſo that

we

we could remove *mountains*, as well as underſtand all *myſteries*; tho' we had alſo the tongues of *angels*, as well as of men, and declaimed ever ſo loudly with them, either for or againſt any particular church; and yet had not *charity*, we ſhould be but empty, noiſy formaliſts in religion; mere *ſounding braſs*, and *tinkling cymbals*. And the words with which this gentleman concludes, tho' he may be but a *lay-man*, are certainly worthy the pen of the moſt eminent biſhop in England, not excepting even his Grace the Metropolitan and Primate of ALL England; † whoſe chriſtian *moderation* is not the leaſt ſhining part of his reſpectable character: 'It is the duty of all men,' ſays he, 'how much 'ſoever they differ in opinion, to agree in mutual *good will*, 'and *kind behaviour*.' Would to God that all biſhops had, and that all proteſtant biſhops at leaſt, would, preach the ſame good doctrine, and practiſe according to it: The former might in a great meaſure have prevented uncharitable diviſions in the chriſtian church; the latter might go far towards healing the preſent animoſities among proteſtants; and lead them to unite in love, and point their force againſt infidelity on one hand, and popery on the other: Both how neceſſary!

And thus I take leave for the preſent, I hope forever, of this controverſy, of which I am heartily weary; tho' not from a conviction that I have been on the wrong ſide, in any material point. If any perſon, without having ſomething that is both *new* and *weighty* to offer upon it, ſhall write and publiſh, merely for the ſake of having the *laſt word*, I beg to excuſe myſelf from being his opponent: I will not contend with him for that *point of honor*; eſpecially if

† This being a title commonly given to the Archbiſhop of Canterbury, may be one reaſon why Mr. *Apthorp* ſpoke of him only, as *preſiding over the church of England*. [See page 10, 11, of theſe *Remarks*] For this, doubtleſs, gives his Grace ſome preeminence above the Archbiſhop of York, who is ſtiled only, *Metropolitan and Primate of England*. And this ſeems to have been long a ſettled point; tho' in former ages there was much *graceleſs* contention between their Graces predeceſſors, for *the higheſt ſeat in the ſynagogue*, and *the uppermoſt room at ſeaſts*; *i. e. for rank and precedency in the* CHURCH *and* COURT.

if he will be ſo *ingenuous* as to own, that he writes for *that end.* The author is not ſolicitous, on whoſe ſide the *laſt word* is, if barely the *truth* is on his. If, by any thing hereafter publiſhed, he ſhould be convinced that he has been materially in the wrong, he will publickly acknowledge it; and give the venerable Society all the ſatisfaction in his power: But One who has written ſo much upon the ſubject already, may ſurely be contented hereafter with only *thinking himſelf in the right*, without again telling the world his opinion. And if he had uſed as much *art* on one ſide, as *ſome perſons* have on the other; and play'd the hero as ſucceſsfully as they ſeem'd very ſure *They* had done, he might not improperly put a period to this *Second*, and, as he hopes, *Laſt Defence*, with,

——————Hic Victor cæſtus *artemque* repono.

But inſtead of that, he ſubmits the whole, with all proper deference, to the judgment of the reader.

CORRECTIONS,

Page,	*line,*	*from,*	*Read,*
42,	16,	Top,	about *toleration,*
53,	3,	Top,	opinions
56,	14,	Bot.	biſhops)

THE END.

2 JY 61

Advertiſement.

THE foregoing *Remarks* may poſſibly fall into the hands of ſome public-ſpirited gentlemen of ample fortunes, abroad; who heartily wiſh well to New-England in all reſpects, and particularly as to the encouragement and increaſe of *Learning* here. The Author therefore, not without the advice and requeſt of ſome gentlemen among us, whoſe opinion has much weight with him, takes this opportunity juſt to mention the very grievous loſs which *Harvard College* in *Cambridge*, near *Boſton*, *New-England*, lately ſuſtained in the entire deſtruction of one of its buildings by fire, together with the whole and valuable *Apparatus* for experimental Philoſophy; and alſo the whole public *Library* (a very valuable one) excepting a few books which happened to be out of it at that time. The friends of Learning and of New-England, who may be both able and charitable, need not be informed how gratefully and reſpectfully any expreſſion of their good-will to ſaid College, towards repairing ſo heavy a loſs, would be received.

Boſton, June 20. 1764.

J. Mayhew.

2 JY 61